CONTENTS.

The names of contributors and their articles.

		Pages.
1.	*R. Subba Rao, M. A., L. T.* A note on the illustration on the Cover.	103—105
2.	*G. V. Seetapati, B. A., L. T.* The Korni Copper plate grants of Anantavarma Chodaganga.	106—124
3.	*Mimamsakacharya S. K. Ramanatha Sastriar.* Bhavabhuti and His Identity.	125—129
4.	*Rev. H. Heras, S. J., M. A.* Who were the Sulikas ?	130—131
5.	*R. Sreenivasa Raghava Iyengar, M A.* Ancient South Indian Gold Coinage.	132—136
6.	*R. Sreenivasa Raghava Iyengar, M. A.* Coins of Kavaliyadavalli Treasure Trove.	137—143
7.	*V. Subramanyam, M A., L. T.* Date of Tenkanaditya.	144—148
8.	*R. Subba Rao, M. A., L. T.* Scope of Anthropological Research in the Agency Part II Chenchus.	149—154
9.	*M. Rama Krishna Kavi, M. A.* Tapasavatsaraja.	155—166
10.	Reviews	167—171
11.	Select Contents from Oriental Journals	

NOTES OF THE QUARTER. I—VI

1. Proceedings of the Council Meetings.
2. List of Subscriptions and Donations received.
3. List of Exchanges.

THE
QUARTERLY JOURNAL
OF THE
ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Vol. 1 JANUARY 1927. No. 3

A NOTE ON THE ILLUSTRATION ON THE COVER.

By R. SUBBA RAO, M. A., L. T.

The illustration on the cover and on the title page of this issue of the journal has been reproduced from a photo of the sculpture taken by me at Amaravati on 18th December 1924 when I took a party of the college students on a historical excursion to study the remains of the Amaravati Stupa.

The subject-matter of the illustration, as can be seen, was carved on marble stone with great elegance and detail. A few marble stones have now been grouped together and formed into what looks like a miniature Stupa close to the ground where once stood the great Buddhist Stupa. A stupa, as may be known to several readers, is a funeral mound raised generally over the sacred relics of the Buddha. It consists of a broad base which supports a dome containing the relic. Above this is placed the spire with one or more roofs.

The Amaravati Stupa is situated on the south bank of the Krishna about twenty miles from Bezwada. In 1797 it was broken open by a local Zamindar who wanted to use the material for his building. Col. Mackenzie who came to know of it paid two visits in 1816 and 1819 and made several drawings from the slabs of the railing and from the base of the Stupa. Further excavations were made in 1845 and the remains obtained were sent to the British Museum. In 1881 the Madras Government made more excavations and some of the sculptures found are now to be seen in the Madras Museum.

The Stupa is an old one though not so old as the Stupa, Chaitya and the monastery found at Sankaram which may belong to the Asoka age. A stone slab found on the site is said to contain

the following important subject matter of an inscription "Hail! In the year........of the illustrious lord, the king Pulomayi, son of Vāsishti........the merit of the gift of a Dharma-Chakra on the west door of the Chaitya of the Buddha in the possession of the Chetika School........". From the discovery of this inscription on the site, one can learn that the Amaravati Stupa was in existence already by the time of Pulomayi who ruled in the latter half of the second century after Christ. Though some of the sculptures and inscriptions belong to the Post-Christian Era, the Stupa itself may be considered to have been built by the early Andhra kings.

The art of the sculpture is purely religious and owes its growth to that of Buddhism. The use of stone for the carving of the pictures must be ascribed to the Buddhistic influence. Generally, the subjects for sculpture are taken from the life of Buddha. But sometimes, representations of processions to holy places, and religious symbols, and contemporary dress etc., are also seen. Over-abundance of detail is the chief feature of this sculpture.

At the top of the illustration, one can see a floral design. Then, the upper part of the illustration is divided by means of five pillars which contain certain highly artistic details, into two divisions each of which is again sub-divided into two compartments by what looks like a pillar.

In the extreme right-hand corner, we can see the figure of a female lying on a cot with a group of four female attendants below and four male figures above–probably Vidyadharas. This may be a scene to depict the dream of Maya Devi, Mother of the Buddha. In the right-hand corner, we see a group of six seated figures engaged in worship. In the extreme left hand corner, we see the standing figure-probably of a Naga receiving worship at the hands of females facing to the left. In the left hand corner, we see four tall male figures and above them another group of four, all facing to the right and marching in a procession.

In the centre of the slab, is seen the figure of a seated Buddha preaching to ten persons, five on either side, of whom three are standing and two are sitting; two lions one on each side, are carved and they face each other with their usual majesty. At the back of the lions are two seated devotees and next to them is seen a miniature Stupa.

The top part of the bottom picture contains two seated lions facing the spectator. To the right of the lions on either side is found a wrestler and to the left two standing female figures. Below we get two beautifully carved out female figures supporting a stand which contains at the top of it a Dharma-Chakra or wheel of law. At the

corners of the top are seen two small figures probably Devaputras. Below the stand are seen two female figures in a kneeling posture and in a state of respectful adoration, and they are seated on a sculptured perspective of lotus.

On either side of this sculpture, we see a small jar, a vertical row of four Dharma-Chakras and a standing female figure with a pipe in the raised right hand. This structure is supported by massive pillars which are sculptured after the Graeco-Roman model. A grotesque image carrying a basket on the head is seen just by the side of the pillar on either side.

It is really admirable that so many details are carved out on a small white marble stone. The crowd of adoring spirits, the four huge lions seated in their majesty and pomp, the several Dharma-Chakras, the lotuses, the Nagas and other figures, the many pillars which contain minute artistic details and whose capitals remind us of the Corinthian style, the seated Buddha receiving worship and many more scenes from his life, and the large number of representations of sacred objects, all these so skilfully worked out on the hard stone remind us of the greatness and importance of the Andhra art. From the picture we also get an insight into the dress and manners of contemporary people. The dress of men consists of a loin cloth or Dhoti. The upper part of the body is bare. Sometimes, a cloth is thrown above the shoulders in a loose way. Head dress is generally found in the form of a turban. The women in all the sculptures are seen clothed only in the loin cloth but their jewels for the wrists and the ankles and their head-dresses are very rich and beautiful. The upper part of the body is uncovered. The females wear an ornamented girdle, head, arm and leg jewels.

We are grateful to the Buddhists for the introduction of stone architecture and for such fine marble sculptures which rival those of Greece and Rome in art and which are incomparable for depicting religious themes.

THE KORNI COPPER PLATE GRANTS OF ANANTAVARMA CHODAGANGA.

Second Set, Saka Samvat 1034.

By G. V. SITAPATI, B. A., L. T.,
Lecturer in History, Rajah's College, PARLAKIMIDI.

The second set also contains 5 copper plates but these plates are larger in size than those of the first set. Each of these plates measures about 10 ½″ by 6″. The ring holding them is about 1 ¼″ thick and 17″ in circumference. The two ends of the ring are soldered into the lower portion of a circular seal about 7 ½″ in circumference, on which is fixed an image of the bull, Nandi couchant, about 1 ¼″ long and 1 ¼″ high. Round the Nandi, there are in the surface of the disc, the usual figures of conch-shell, chowrie etc. I cut the ring and detached the plates in order to take copies of them. The edges of the plates are very slightly raised into rims to protect the inscription. The inscription contains 138 lines. It has suffered at several places from corrosion and consequently, several 'aksharas' connot be read with certainty.

The *Alphabet* employed belongs to the Old Canarese type and the characters are exactly like those used in the Vizag copper plate grant of *Anantavarma Chodaganga*, Saka 1010, edited and published by Dr. Fleet in Vol. 18 of the Indian Antiquary. The points that call for notice in respect of Orthography are as follows:—

1. û, ṛ, r, ḷ, l, ai, au—these vowels do not occur in this inscription.
2. chh, jh—these do not occur separately; they are found in combination with other consonants.
3. i, ga, ḍa, ṭha, ya, ra, la, m, h,—these are exactly like the corresponding Telugu characters of the present day; the mark representing 'a' is, however, different as noted in point 7 below.
4. a, â, î, u, ê, ô, kha, gha, ga, cha, ja, na, ṇa, ta, na, pa, ba, bha, ma, Ra, va, sha, sa—these are almost like the corresponding Telugu characters of the present day. 'â' is distinguished from 'a' by a small curved line at the top of the right corner of the symbol denoting 'a' (vide ll 84, 89, 119). It is not possible to say definitely whether ô and ê in "ômbravêlli" are really long or short. This is the name of a Telugu village which is still in existence and is known as "omaravilli".
5. ka, ṭa, śa—these are almost like the corresponding Canarese characters.

6. ṭa, tha, da, dha—these are slightly different from the corresponding Telugu characters of the present day.
7. The mark denoting 'a' attached to a consonant is shaped in the form of a crescent. 'u' attached to a consonant is represented in three different ways. In many cases, the mark resembling a horn as in "bhu" (l. 2) is attached to the proper right of the consonant. In some cases, as in "du" (l. 1) the same mark is attached to the lower part of the letter. In a few cases, as in "ssu" (l. 2) the mark resembling the Telugu figure ౧ is attached to the proper right of the consonant. "mu" is represented in the first two ways (of. ll 102 and 1). "tsu" is represented in the first and third ways (of. ll 2 and 25). "ô" is represented in two ways; generally by the mark used now in Telugu and rarely by a combination of marks denoting 'ê' and 'û'. 'ô' and 'au' are not clearly distinguished; cf. "sô" (l. 66) and "sau" (l. 49).
8. The nasal sound, except before the cerebral consonants, is generally represented by the anusvâra. 'n' is combined with "ta" only in "antarhita" (L. 53). The anusvâra is used before a cerebral only in "kamḍikâ" (l. 49),—but this word ought to be "kaṇṭhikâ"—and in "kamṭham" in the same line.
9. Consonants other than "sh" and "h" coming after "r" are always doubled.

The *Language* of the plates is throughout Samskrit. The use of "niyatya" for "nihatya" (l. 47) and "abhram liyam" for "abhram liham" (l. 61) are probably due to the influence of Prakrit. The absolute construction of the past participle noted in my previous article occurs in this inscription also, (Vide ll. 120, 122–123, 127–128).

There are 40 slokâs:— 12 Sardûlavikriḍitas, 11 Anushṭubhs, 5 Sragdharas, 3 Upajâtis, 2 Vasantatilakas, 2 Vamsasthas, 1 Mandâkrânta, 1 Sikhiriṇi, 1 Manjubhâshini, 1 Viyôgini and 1 Svâgata. Some of the Anushṭubhs are not composed according to the rule laid down in "स्लोके षष्ठंगुरु, जेयं etc.

(Vide the 3rd quarter of जित्व बाहु, etc. ll 37 38 and the first quarter of अनुरागेण गुणिनो ll. 84–85.)

The *Sandhi* rules are observed in the slokas but not always in the prose portion. Examples are not given because they are the same as those that occur in the first set.

There are many evidences to show that the language of the people in the Kalinga country was about the time of Anantavarma Chodaganga, Telugu. The Telugu verse, (Sîsa padyam) in the

Dîrghâsi inscription edited and published by my father in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. iv., is the most conclusive evidence. That inscription refers to the time of Râjarâja, the father of Anantavarma. The absolute construction of the past participle referred to, in connection with the language of the plates, is probably due to the influence of Telugu idiom,

"Râshṭra kûṭa pramukhân" (L. 107) is translated as the elders of the taluks. In some of the South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. iv., we find "râshṭrakûṭa" in the Samskrit portion and "raṭṭadam" in the Telugu portion. From the context, I think that these words refer to a smaller division of a region of the kingdom.

The inscription records the *grant* of a piece of land to the Brâhmans residing in Khônna and a reference is made to the grant recorded in the first set. There is one discrepancy in this inscription. Anantavarma says "The village, Khônna was in Saka 1003, granted to 300 Brâhmans by my grand-father, Vajrahastadêva." In the first set, we find that the grant was made by Anantavarma himself. In both the inscriptions, it is mentioned that Anantavarma was annointed king in Saka 999. The grantor could not, therefore, have been Vajrahasta if the grant was made in Saka 1003. Probably Vajrahasta made an oral grant and Anantvarma recorded it in Saka 1003. The grant referred to in this inscription was made in Saka 1034 at the time of winter solstice. This date corresponds to the 1st January 1113. I am indebted to Sriman Nilamani Panigrahi Mahasayo (Parlakimidi) for this calculation.

The *Genealogy* of the *Ganga Kings* is traced from the Creator. The genealogical list agrees with what is given in the Vizag-grant of Saka 1040 but this grant contains more details than are given in the grant of 1040 regarding the exploits of some of the kings.

In this grant it is mentioned that Kâmârnava I killed *Sabarâditya* (I. 47) and that *Dantâvuram* was his capital (l. 48) while the grant of 1040, says that Kâmârnava killed *Bâlâditya* and that *Jantâvuram* was his capital. As the facsimile was not published along with his article, it was not possible to verify his reading. But I have looked into the plates; Dr. Fleet's reading is incorrect. I found in it "samara śirasi śabalâdityan–nirjjitya ... ... dantâvuran-nâma" but Dr. Fleet read it by mistake as "samaranirasikam bâlâdityan–nirjjitya ... ... jantâvuran-nâma". It is not possible to say whether "sabarâditya" or "sabalâditya" is the correct name of the person killed by Kâmârnava I. In my next article I shall refer to this and some other points of historical interest.

TEXT[1]

First plate, second side.

1. óm[2] lakshmī nishê (vya)m-udurâjakalmka kâmti bâhâchatushṭaya-chaṇam vapur-âdadhânah prâdu–
2. r-bbabhúva bhuvanatritayam vidhitsur-vvisvaprasútijaṭharô[3] bhagavân-anamtah *(a)* tan-nâbhîṇali–
3. nâd-babhùva bhuvanaprârambhadîkshâratô brahmâ vêdaparam-parâ[4] paridadhadvaktraiś-chaturbbhis-tatah prâ–
4. jâpatyadhurâdhiruḍhamahasâm–atrir–munînâm prabhur–jjâtas-sarvvajanêna[5] nitya tapasâm vrâtô va–
5. pushmân-iva*(b)* atrêh putrô babhuva tripuraharajaṭha[6]jùṭanêpath-yaratnam nêtravyâpâradêsasmaracharita–
6. mahânâṭikâ sutradhârah dṛshṭâmtô dâ(kshinâ) tyâ mukhamukura ruchâm śarvvarî jîvîtêśas-trailôkyânam–
7. dakamdô gaganatalamahâmbhô lhiśam(kha)ś-śaśâkah[7]*(c)*tatô jagat-tâpabhishajyita[8]-tvashaś-śubhagrahô bhù–
8. d-vibudhâgraṇîr-bbudhah purôravas[9]-tattanayô yad-ullasad-bhujê bhuji-shyârṇnavamêkhalâ babhau*(d)*
9. tasmâd-âyuś-śubhamyus-tribhuvanavinutô janma lêbhê tadîyah putrô bhúj-jaitrabâhur-nnahu
10. shanarapatir-bbhúbhṛtâm-agraganyah yah pṛthvyâm-êkapatnyâm-anubhavavimukhô bhùrijâtaprjâyâ–
11. m svarvvêśyâm khanḍitêmdrâm praṇayaparavaśah paurushêṇânva-bhunta[10]*(e)* tatô yayâtir-vvijitâbhiya–
12. tir-jjajṇê tatas-thurvvasur[11]-urvvarêśah sa púrvvagîrvvâṇagurôr-ggarimṇâ mâtâmahasy-ôrasi hi pravṛddhah *(f)*
13. aputratvam prâptas-suchiram-atikhinnô nṛpavṛshas-sa gamgâm-arâdhyân-niyatagatir-â–
14. râdhya varadâm ajêyam gâmgêyam sutam-alabhat-ârabhya cha tadâ kramas-tadvamsyânâ–

1. From the original plates.
2. denoted by a symbol.
3. In the Vizag. Copper plate grant of S. 1040 also it is 'jatharô' not 'jarathô' as read by Dr. Fleet.
4. Read "paramparàm".
5. Read "janina".
6. Read "jatá".
7. Read "sasâmkah"
8. Read "bhishajjitatvisha".
9. Read "purûrava".
10. Read "bhuñkta".
11. Read "tatasturvasu".

(a). Vasantatilaka.
(b). särdûlavikrīdita.
(c). sragdhara.
(d). vamsastha
(e). sragdhara.
(f). upajâti.

15. m bhuvi jayati gamgânvaya iti*(g)* asyâsît-tanayô virôchanavibhur vvairigrahâ-

16. stâchalah kshôṇînâthakirîṭapatramakarîlagnâmghrirêṇùtkarah lakshmîvâ

Second plate, first side.

17. gvanitâ mahâkulanadî samvêdyam-udyôginam samvêdyam samajîjanat-sa nṛpatir-ggamga[1]nvayôtta-

18. msakan[2]*(a)* samvêdyatô maṇir-ivâjani nâma bhâsvân bhùpâlamaulimakuṭair-upapâlanîyah

19. trâsâdidôsharahitas-sa babhúva putrî yat-sampadân-nidhir-ajayata[3] datta-senah*(b)* tasyôrvvî

20. śvaramaulimaṇḍanamanêr - âsîd - asâdhâranâm bibhrânô nṛpati śriyam priyasutas-saumyôti ra-

21. myâkṛtih tasmâd-apy-udapâdi môditajagach-chakrômśudattas-tatah saurâmgô-bhavad-anyarâḍgajaghaṭâpâta-

22. kriyâpâkalah*(c)* tasmâch-chitrâgadô[4] bhùt-kshititalavalayê râja-śabdaikava-chyas-súnus-sâradhvajôsya[5]-bhavad-a-

23. khilabhuvâm-âdhipatyaprasùtih dharmmasî tat-tanújô[6] nṛpanaya-padavî pâmthamukhyô virêjê

24. babhrâjâpatyam-asya kshitijayaparavân-êkadhanvā parîkshit *d* 1 sa mahîpatis-suta

25. m-avapa[7] mânêna jayasênam-anyanṛpadarppaśâtanam abhavat-sutôsya jaya

26. sênasamjṇitah prathayan diśâ sitadukùlitam yaśah *e* jitavîryyam-a-

27. sâv-ajîjanat-sa cha bhupâlavṛsham vṛshadhvajam sahaśaktim-alamghya śâsana

28. m vijigîshum suvirôdhibhîshaṇam*(f)* tasya pragalbhas - tanayô babhuva kshitîśamârggâchara-

29. ṇapragalbhah yah khaḍgadhârâjaladhautavairinârîkapôlasthala-patrabhamgah*(g)*

30. âsîd - êkasitâtapatratilakakshôṇîbhṛd - asyâtmajô vîraśrî vanitâ svayam

31 vṛtapatir-ddêvas-sa kôlâhalam nirmmâyôrjjitagamgavâḍivishayê kôlâ-

1. Read "gamga".
2. Read "msakam".
3. Read "ajâyata".
4. Read "chitramgado".
5. Read "dhvajôsya".
6. Probably "dharmmakhyas-tat-tanùjo".
7. Read "avapa maninam".

(g). sikhiriṇî.

(a) sardûlavikrîditam.
(b) vasantatilaka.
(c) sardùlavikrîditam.
(d) sragdhara.
e) manjubhashini.
(f) viyôgini.
(g) upajati.

32 halâkhyâm[1] puram yaś chakrê surasadmavîkshaṇarasapratyuham-
akshâm[2] harê

33 h *(a)* tat—sutô dhṛtaśarâsanayashṭir—ggâm-arakshad-apavarjjita
śauryyam[3]

Second plate, second side.

34. śâsa (napra) thitapâśavidhêyâm—êka êva sa virôchanasamjnah *(b)*
gatê tatra narêmdrâṇâm kôlâhalapurîbhujâm

35. (êkâsî) tyâm cha tad—vamśyô vîrasimhô—bhavan—nṛpah *(c)*
chölâmś—châlayataś—chamu chalantah pâṇḍyân bhruvâ bhug-
nayâ

36. humkarêṇa[4] cha saptakômkaṇapatîn—ṇyakkâratah kêralân amta-
kôpa[5]vighurṇnamâna—śirasâ karṇnâṭalâṭêśvarân—asyô—

37. (nmatta?) kṛpâṇavîkshanadhṛti[6] kê vâ yayur bbhubhṛtah*(d)* jitvâ
bâhubalènôrvvîm vîrasimhas-sa bhupatis-satkriyâsa-

38. mabhihârair—vvijigyê sadma nâkinâm *(e)* tasya kâmārṇṇavas—
sûnur—dânârṇnava—guṇârṇnavau mârasi—

39. mha iti khyâtâ vajrahastâkhyapamchamah *(f)* kâmârṇnavah
pitṛbhrâtur—asahishṇô[7] kulô—

40. dvahah śaktôpi râjyaharaṇê jahau dêsan—na tu kramam *(g)*
chaturbhir—anujair—bbhimdan—narê—

41. mdrân—âhavôtsukân damtair—ddaityân—ivêmdrêbhas—sa pra-
yâd[8]—vâsavîm diśam *(h)* a (tha) va—

42. nyêbhadâ(nau)ghadviguṇîkṛtani(rjjha)[9]ram vilikhamtan—nabhaś-
śṛmgair - mahêmdram prarurôha sah *(i)* tatra cha

43. sakalasurâsurasiddhasâdhyaparârddhyakirîṭakôṭinighṛshṭamasṛṇal
acharaṇapî - ṭham - ârâdhya gô—

44. karṇnasvâminam - asya prasâdāsâditadhavalachchhatrachâmara-
sâmajadhvajavṛshabhalâmchchhâ[10]napimchchhâmchi—

45. takumtanikaramakaratôraṇahuḍukkakâhalaika śamkhâdirâjyôchi-
tair - upaśôbhamânas - sâkshân - ma—

46. hêmdra iva mahêmdrâchalasikharâd - avatîryya yudhishṭhira iva
chaturbbhiranujair - anuga—

47. myamanas[11] - samaraśirasi śabarâdityan - niyatya[12] kâmârṇnavah
kalimgân - agṛhît tasya

48. cha vijitasakalanṛpatipuram - apahasitasurêmdrapuram damtâvu-
ran - nama na—

49. garî râjadhâny - âsît | asau dānārṇnavam - anujam kamḍikā-[13]
bamdhurakamṭham vi—

1. Read "kôlahalah"
2. Read "akshnam"
3. Read "chauryyam"
4. " "humkarena"
5. Read "amtahkôpa"
6. Read "dhrtim"
7. " "hishnôh"
8. " "praya"
9. "rjjha" is not very clear
10. " "lamchhana"
11. " "mana"
12. Read "nihatya"
13. " "kamthika"

(a) sardûlavikrîditam. (b) svagata. (c) slôka.
(d) sardulavikrîdita. (e—i) slôkas.

Third plate. First side.

50. dhāya guṇārṇṇavāyāmbavādivishayam mārasimhāya sô (dā) ma (rḍa) lam vajrahastāya
51. ka (mṭa) kavarttanîm - adāt | êvam cha karmêṇa shaṭtṛmśa[1]dvar-shān kalimgān apālayat | tasya cha śrî—
52. (ma) tām - asêshabhuvanasamstûyamānavimalayaśasām - atula-bhujakṛpāṇākrshṭavi
53. jayalakshmîsamālimgitôttumgavakshasthalānām charaṇatalakāmti samdhyāvad - antarhitasama
54. stanarapatikadambakānām - anavaratarājyavinôdāpahasitamahêm-drānām - mahêmdrā - chalasikhara—
55. pratishṭhitasya sakalabhuvananirmmāṇaikasutradhārasya charā-charagurôr - bbhagavatô gokarṇnasvāminah samā—
56. rā ḍhāna[2]labdhanikhilamanôrathānām - âtrêyagôtrāṇām gamgānām kulamalamkari - shnôr - vvishnôr - iva
57. vikramākrāmtasakalamahîmaṇḍalasya kāmārṇnvasyānujô dānārṇ-navaś - chatvārim - śatam - abdakān
58. rājyam - akārshît | tat - sutô dvitîyakāmārṇnavah panchāśad[3]var-shān mahî (maṇḍala)
59. m - amaṇḍayat | tasya tiraskṛtatrivishṭapam nagaran-nāma puram āsît tasmin sô—
60. pi madhukavṛkshajananād - îśasya limgākṛtêh kṛtvākhyām madhu kêśa ity - aracha yat - prā—
61. sādam - abhram liyam[4] yad - dvārôrddhvavichitrapatralatikāś-chitrāṇi vā pasyatām saudhā—
62. ny - ambaravarttinām hṛdi bhavên - nyunam vimānāruchih (*a*) tat - tanayô raṇārṇnavah pamchava—
63. rshān - mahîm - aharshayat | tat - sunur - dvitîyô vajrahastah pamchadaśasamāh kshamām ara—
64. kshat tasyānujas - trtîyah kāmārṇnavôrṇnavamêkhalām - êkôna-vimsatisam—
65. vatsarān (sa)m-avarddhayat | tasya varṇnanê slôkah vaichitryam dṛḍhatā cha saushṭha—
66. vam - iti (trê) thā dhanuhkarmaṇām sômārkkānvayayôr - ddadhau samadhuram kāma
67. rṇnavô (rā)ghavah vivyādhaikaśarêṇa saptasubhaṭān kaśchij-jighāmsun vanê[5]ta
68. t - samkhyān - aparas - tarun - iti pṛthak - kîrttir - vvarî vṛtya-tê (*b*) tatstutô guṇārṇna—

1. Read "shattrimsa" 2. Read "samaradhana" 3. Read "pamoha"
4. Read "libam." 5. "nê" is not clear.

(a) and (b)— sardulavikrîditas.

Third plate, Second side.

69. vas - saptavimsatim - abdān - abdir - aśanām vaśam - anaishit tad - ātmajah pôtāmkusah pamchadaśava—

70. tsarān mahîn - nissapatnâm - akârshit | tatas - tad - bhrâtus-sutah kalimgalâm - kusô dvâdaśavatsarân

71. kalimgân - alam chakâra | tatas - tasya pitṛbhrâtā saptavarshân guṇḍamarâjô mahîma—

72. ṇḍilamaṇḍanô babhûva | tasyânujaś - chaturtthah kâmârṇnavah pamchavimśatim varshân vasumdharâ—

73. m - anubâbhûva | tayôh kanîyân - vinayâdityô varshatrayam dharitrîm - atrâyata | tatas - taj - jêshṭhasya[1]

74. kâmârṇnavasya sutaś - chaturtthô vajrahastah pamchatrimśatam - abdakân mahîm - ibhamadajaladhâ

75. râbhir - abhyashimchat tasya varṇnanê slôkah | artthibhyah kariṇâm sahasram - atulam kâli(m)ga(kâmtâra)[2]

76. jam yad - dattam surabhîchakâra karaṭaprasyamdidânair - diśah tad-damtair-iva pâṇḍur - âma

77. laruchâ dânair - ivâ môdinâ vyâptâni trijagamti divyayaśasâ śrîvajrahasta(prabhôh) |

78. tatas - tat - sutah pamchakâmârṇnavôrddhasamâm - ilâm pâla-yâmâsa | tatas - tad - anujô

79. dvitîyô guṇḍamarâjas-trîṇi varshâṇi dharâdhuramdharô babhûva | tasya dvaimâtarô bhrâta shashṭhô

80. madhukâmârṇnava êkônavimśativarshâṇi visâmpatir - abhût | tatas - tadîyanamdanô vajra—

81. hastas-trayatrimśatam-abdakân-mahîm-udavahat tasya varṇnanê slôkâh 1 vyâptê gamgakulôttamasya

82. yaśasâ dikchakravâlê śaśipradyôtâmalinêna yasya bhuvanaprahlâ-dasampâdinâ simdûrai—

83. r - atisâmdrapamkapaṭalaih kumbhasthalîpaṭṭakêshv - âlimpamti punah punaś - cha haritâm - â

84. dhôraṇâ varaṇân *(b)* anurâgêṇa guṇinô yasya vakshô mukhâbjayôh âsînê śrî

85. sarasvatyâv - anukûlê virâjatah*(c)* nanâmatah kêvalam-artthatôpi sa vajra-hasta—

1. read "jyeshṭha".   2. These letters are not clear.

(a) and (b) sardulavikriditas.   (c) slôka.

Fourth plate, first side.

86. s-tri (kalimganâ) thah kô vajrahastâd-aparam pṛthivyâm [1] vajram patad-vârayitum samartthah (*a*) tatsu

87. tô (râjarâja)h kshamâm - arakshad - asbṭ ısamvatsarân | tasya varṇnanê slôkâ | sa râjarâjah prathama—

88. m jayaśriyah patir-bbabhûva dravilâhavôtsavê virâjamânam-atha râjasumdarîm-udû—

89. ḍhavâ(n)ś-chô (ḍı) mahîbhujâtmajā n (*b*) tyaktvâ vêmgim sapadi pariṇâmôdayê dyâm-ivâñyâm chôḍıvyâ—

90. jê mahati vijayâdityam-abdhau mimakshu [2] âpannânam paramaśıraṇam râjarâjô vichitram la—

91. kshmîbhâjam suchiram-akarôt-paśchimâyâm diśâyâm (*c*) tasyâsîd-agrasùnuh pṛthulanijabhu—

92. jâ vikram - aurjjityasāras - satyatyâgaikasîma vimalatarayaśaś-chamdrikadhau - talôkah vâgullamghi—

93. pratâpaś - śubhacharitanidhir - bbhâgyê[3]saubhagyarasih kshôṇi-prâṇâdhinâthas - sakalaripuma—

94. nô bhamgadas - chôḍagamgah (*d*) śâkâbdê namdaramdhragraha-gaṇagaṇitê kumbha samsthê di—

95. nêśê suklê pakshê trtîyâyuji ravijadinê rêvatîbhê nṛyugmê lagnê gamgânvavâyâ—

96. mbhujavanadinakṛd - viśvavisvambharâyâśchakram samrakshitum sadguṇanidhir - adhipas - chôḍagamgô bhi—

97. shiktah (*e*) bhîmam vâhamahôrmibhir - bbahubṛhannâgêmdracha-krâkulam [4] nânâśa - straphaṇîmdrabrmdagaha—

98. nam krôdhasphuradbâdabam sênâbdhim dvishatâm pramathya mahatādôrmmam - darêṇāgrahîl - lakshmîm kîrtti—

99. sudhām cha visvavibudhānamdāya sārṅgîva yah (*f*) vîrasrîr-bbhujadaṇḍıyu - gmakalitā yasyâ—

100. ridarppachchhidas stambhadvamdvaniyamtritaikakariṇîsādṛ—syamāślishyatê yat - pādadvitayāmti—

101. kapranayinah kshôṇibhṛtām - maulayatpāyat[5]padmayugānusāri-madhupaśrêniśriya-

102. m bibhrati 1 purvvasyām disi purvvam - utkalapatim rajyê nidhāyādbhutam[6] paśchāt - paśchima-

1. Read "parahprthivyâm" 2. Read "mimamkshum" 3. Read "bhagya"
4. Probably "nakara" instead of "chakra" 5. Read "ssphaya"
6. Read "nîdhya chyutam.

(a)—upajati. (b)—vamsastha. (c)—mandakranta (d) and (e)—sragdharas. (f) and (g)—sardulavikriditas.

Fourth plate second side.

103. diktaṭa vighaṭiam vêmgiśam-apy-êtayôh lakshmî bhamlanamâlikâm-ivajayaśrî—
104. tôraṇastambhayôr-bbadhnâti sma samiddhakîrttivibhava śrîgamgachuḍâmaṇih *(a)* sa—
105. śrîmad-anamtavarmmâ mahârâjô râjâdhirâjô râjaparamêsvaraparamabhaṭṭârakah
106. paramamahêsvarah paramavaishnavah paramabrahmanyô mâtâpitṛpâdânudhyâtaśrîchô—
107. ḍagamgadêvah varaha[2] varttanivishayê vâśinô[3] râshṭrakuṭapramukhân kuṭumbinas-sarvvân
108. ssamâhûya purôhitâmâtyayuvarâjasamdhivigrahidauvârikapramukhapa—
109. rijanasamaksham - ittham - âjnâpayati viditam - astu vô yathâ 1 bhavad - vishayê khônnagrâ—
110. mah muṇḍapaRunâmagrâmam grâsîkṛtvâ chatussîmâvachchhinnas - sajalasthalas - sarvva—
111. pîḍâvivarjjitam - âchamdrârkkakshitisamakâlam yan-mâtâpitrôrâtmanaś - cha puṇyaya—
112. sôbhivṛddhayê haranayanaviyadgaganachamdragaṇitêshu śakavatsarêshu mînamâ—
113. sakṛshnapamchamyâm-âdityavârê sâmânyatô nânâgôtrêbhyôdhyayanâdhyâpana-yajanayâ—
114. janadânapratigrahashaṭkarmmaniratêbhyas - triśatad[4] - brâhmanêbhyô dhârâpûr-vvakam mat-pritâmahêna[5] va—
115. jrahastadêvêna dattam | tatra gâragrâmagṛhîtamuṇḍapaRugrâmasya pratikshêtratvêna tû—
116. luvugrâmâd - âhṛtyâshṭôttarâśîtiparimitam kshêtram têbhyah khônnagrâma-nivâsibrâ—
117. hmaṇêbhyah vêdaguṇaviyachchamdragaṇitêshu sakavatsarêshuttarâyaṇanimi—

Fifth plate, first side.

118. ttê dhārāpurvvakam - asmābhir - ddattam - iti | asya kshêtrasya pratikshêtrêṇa sārddham sîmālimgāni
119. purvvatah khônna ômbaravêlli tônemgi grāmānām trikuṭê tônêmgigrāma - vakragarttā | āgnê

1. Read "lakshmîm".
2. Read "varaha".
3. Read "vasinô".
4. Read "trisatabrahmana".
5. Read "matpitamahena"

(a) sardulavikrîdita.

120. yataḥ vālmīka[1]sahitamarichavṛkshah | tat - paśchimataḥ īshad-vakra[2]gatvā marichavṛkshapantiḥ [3]

121. tataḥ khônna tônêmgi khôllira grāmānām trikuṭê vālmīkaśahita-maricha vṛkshah | da-

122. kshinasyām diśi bṛhadvalmīkah | tat - paśchimataḥ vanarāji-kāh | tatô garttām - ullamghya

123. sthāpitaśilā | tataḥ kramêna sthāpitam silātryam | nairṛtyāmdiśi sthāpitaśilā

124. tad - uttarataḥ sthāpitaśilâ | tata ī[4]ṇidalasêtôr - adhas - timtriṇī-vṛksha samīpê

125. sthāpitaśilā | tatas - taṭākapravishṭagarttāmukham | tatô garttā-tīrê sthāpitaśilā

126. tatô garttaiva | vāyavyadiśāyām garttāłvayasamdhau timtriṇī-vṛksha-

127. samīpê sthāpitaśilā | tatô garttānusārêṇa prāchīm diśam kimchid-vakram gatvā

128. tām garrtām - ullamghyôttaratô gatvā khênna tuluvu gāra grā-mānām trikuṭê garttādva-

129. yamadhyasthāpitaśila | uttarasyām diśi taṭākadvayasêtusamdhiḥ | īśānadisā-

130. yām khônna gāra ômbaravêlli grāmānām tônêmgigarttātīratri-kah | a-

131. syôpari na kêna chid-bādhaḥ karttavyaḥ tathā hi vyāsêna bhaga-vatoktam | bahubhir - vvasu-

132. dhā dattā rājabhis - sagarādibhir - yyasyayasya yadā bhumis-tasya tasya tadā

Fifth plate, second side.

133. phalam*(a)* svadattâm paradattâm vâ yatnād-raksha yudhishṭhira mahīm-mahīmatām śrêshṭhadā

134. nāch - chhrêyônupālanam *(b)* gām - êkām[5] svarnnam[6] - êkam vā bhumêr-apy-êkam-amgulam ha—

135. ran - narakam - āpnôti yāvad - ābhutasamplavam*(c)* svadattam paradattām vā yô harêta va—

136. sumdharām shashṭhim varshasahasrāṇi vishṭhāyām jāyatê krimir*(d)*-iti karttā kāvyasya śā

137. sanādhikārī jātavédibhaṭṭaḥ | lêkhakô vallênāchāryyasutô baṭṭênāchā—

138. ryyaḥ 1.

1. Read "valmīka" 2. Read "vakram" 3. Read "parktiḥ"

4. It is not very clear whether this letter is "ī" or "ra."

5. Read "gamekam". 6. Read "svarnna".

(a) to (d) ślôkas.

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

(1-12) The divine Lord *Ananta* (Vishnu) became manifest with the desire of creating the three worlds. From the lotus that grew from his navel there arose *Brahma* reciting the Vedas with his four mouths. From him was born *Atri*, the lord of the sages. He begat *Sasânka* (the Moon). His son was *Budha*, the best of the gods. His son was *Purûravas*. His son was *Ayus*. From him was born *Nahusha* who had many children and leaving the earth in disgust ruled over the kingdom of Indra.

(12-15) From Nahusha was born *Yayâti*. His son was *Turvasu* who grew on the breast through the power of his maternal grandfather (Sukra), the preceptor of Râkshasas (purvagīrvāna). Being without sons and in consequence, much distressed for a long time, Turvasu propitiated (the river) Gangā and obtained a son, *Gângêya*. Since then, his descendents have been victorious in the world under the name, Gangānvaya.

(15-29) Turvasu's son was *Virôchana* who received the submission of many kings. His son was *Sumvêdya* the best of Gangānvaya His son was *Bhâsvân*. From him was born *Dattasêna*. His son was *Saumya*. His son was *Amsudatta*. From him was born *Saurânga*. His son was *Chitrângada* who alone in the whole world deserved the title of king. From him was born *Sâradhvaja*, His son was *Dharma*, the best of those that walked on the path of duty. His son was *Parikshit*. His son was *Jayasena* who destroyed the pride of the rival kings. His son was also known by the name of *Jayasena*. He begot *Jitavîrya*. His son was *Vrshadhvaja* who caused terror to his foes. From him was born *Pragalbha*.

(30-34) Pragalbha's son was *Kôlâhala* who built the city of Kôlāhala(Kolhāpur)in the Gāngavādi vishaya. His son was *Virôchana*.

(34-39) When there had gone by 81 kings who enjoyed the city of Kôlāhala, there arose in his lineage, *Vîrasimha*. Among the kings (of his time) who had the courage (even) to look at the maddened sword of this (Vīrasimha) who terrified the Chôlās by the march of his armies, the Pāndyâs by his brow-beating, the seven Kônkana kings by a menacing roar, the Kêralās by a cry of contempt, the kings of Karnāta and Lāta by a threatening movement of his head. He had five sons, Kāmārnava, Dānārnava, Guṇārnava, Mārasimha and Vajrahasta.

(39-51) *Kâmârnava* though he could have recovered his kingdom usurped by his father's brother left the country (to him) but not dharma. He set out with his four brothers and destroying the

foes that attacked him (on the way) marched eastwards. He got up the mountain Mahêndra and worshipped the god Gôkarṇasvâmi. With all the insignia of universal sovranty which he obtained through his (Gokarnasvâmi's) favour shone like Mahêndra. He descended from the summit of the moutain. Mahêndra and accompanied like Yudhishṭhira by his brothers killed *Sabaraditya* on the battlefield and took possession of the kingdom of Kalinga. The city of *Dantavura* which excelled all the cities of all the kings and (even) the city of Surêndra, was his capital. Having decorated his younger brother, Dānārṇava with the necklace (of royalty–thus nominating him as his successor) he gave Ambavāḍi vishaya to Guṇārṇava Sôlāmaṇḍala to Mārasimha, Kaṇṭakavartani to Vajrahasta and himself ruled the Kalinga kingdom for 36 years.

(51–62) Of Kāmārṇava who adorned the family of the Gangās that obtained the fulfilment of all their desires by propitiating the divine Gôkarṇasvāmi, established on the summit of the mountain. Mahêndra and that belonged to Atrêya gôtra,—the younger brother *Danarnava* reigned for 40 years. His son, *Kamarnava* II reigned for 50 years. He had for his capital the city named *Nagara* which excelled the city of Indra. In that city he built a lofty temple for an emblem of the god, Iśa (śiva) in the form of a linga to which he gave the name of Madhukêsa because it came out of a Madhuka tree.

(62–68) His son *Ranarnava* made the Earth happy for 5 years. His son, *Vajrahasta* II protected the earth for 15 years. His younger brother *Kamarnava* III made the earth prosperous for 19 years. His unique fame spread wide thus:—Kāmārṇava the descendent of Sôma (the Moon) and Rāghava the descendent of Surya (the Sun) had equal prowess in the three—fold use of the bow, displaying surprise, steadiness, and grace but while one of them (Kāmārṇava) struck down with one arrow seven warriors that came with the desire of killing him, the other (Rāghava) struck down seven trees.

(69–80) His son, *Gunarnava* held the earth in subjection for 27 years. His son *Potamkusa* kept the earth without a rival wife in his affection for 15 years. Then his brother's son, *Kalingalankusa* adorned the kingdom of Kalinga for 12 years. Then his father's brother, *Gundana* was the ornament of the earth for 7 years. His youger brother, *Kamarnava IV* enjoyed the earth for 25 years. Their younger brother, *Vinayaditya* protected the earth for 3 years. Then his eldest brother, Kāmārṇava's son, *Vajrahasta IV* reigned for 35 years. He made the Earth wet with the rut of the elephants. He gave to those that asked a thousand elephants of the Kalinga forest and his fame as white as the tusks of those elephants and as odoriferous as their rut spread to the three worlds. Then his son, *Kamarnava V* reigned for half a year. Then his younger brother, *Gundama II*

reigned for 3 years. Then his maternal half-brother, *Madhukamarnava VI* reigned for 19 years.

(80-91) Then his son, *Vajrahasta* reigned for 33 years. The fame of (Vajrahasta) the best of the Gangas,as pure as the moon-light spread in all directions bringing joy to the world. Who is able to ward off the thunderbolt (of Indra) except Vajrahasta (i. e. he who holds a thunderbolt in his hand), the lord of Tri-Kalinga, on whose breast resides Lakhmi, (the goddes of wealth) and in whose mouth resides Sarasvati (the goddess of Learning). His son, *Rajaraja* reigned for 8 years. He first became the husband of the goddess of Victory in the festival of battle with the Dravilas and next married Rājasundari the daughter of the Chôḍa king. When Vijayāditya grew old like the setting sun, left Vengi which was like the west and was about to sink in the ocean of troubles caused by the Chôlas, Rājarāja the refuge of the distressed caused him to enjoy prosperity for a long time in the western region itself.

(91-104) His eldest son, *Chôdaganga* who was (like the sun to the collection of the lotus flowers of the Ganga family and who was endowed with many good qualities was for the purpose of protecting the world, annointed king in the Saka year 999 denoted by the (9) Nandas, (9) apertures, (9) planets when the sun was in the Kumbha (Aquarius) on Saturday, the third lunar day of the bright fortnight under the Rêvati star and during the Mithuna (Gemini) lagna. He the ornament of the Gangas first replaced the fallen lord of Utkala in the eastern region and then the waning lord of Vengi in the western region and restored their fortunes.

(104-108) The prosperous Mahārāja Anantavarma, the Rājādhirāja, the Paramabhattāraka,—etc., he, the glorious Chôdagangadêva who medidates on the feet of his parents, having called together the elders of the several taluks residing in the Varāhavartani Vishaya issues a command in the presence of the priest, minister, heir—apparent—and other officials of the state, thus:—"Be it known to you all—

(109-115) "that my grandfather, Vajrahasta, for the advancement of the religious merit and fame of (his) mother, father and himself, granted in the saka year, 1003, denoted by the Moon (1), sky (O), sky (O), Siva's eyes (3), in the Solar month of Mina (Pisces), on Sunday, the fifth lunar day of the dark fortnight, the village of Khônna with the right of using the lands of the village of MuṇḍapaRu, situated in Varâhavartani, enclosed by the four boundaries, with all the waters (within the enclosed land) to 300 brāhmans of several gôtras, devoted to the six religious rites, viz., performing and conduc-

ting sacrifices, studying and teaching the Vêdas and giving and accepting donations.

(115-118) "There a land measuring 88 taken from the village of Tuluvu, as the pratikshêtram of MuṇḍapaRu taken from Gāra, has been granted by us, in the Saka year. 1034, denoted by the Moon (1) the sky (O) gunas (3), the Vedas (4), at the time of the winter solstice, to the brahmans residing in the village of Khônna."

(118-130) The boundaries of this land with the Pratik, shêtram:—To the east, the winding watercourse of the village-Tônêngi at the meeting place of the (three) villages, Khônna, Ombara, vêlli and Tônêngi. To the south-east, a Marîcha tree with an ant-hill to the west of which (there is) after turning round a small curve a row of Marîcha trees, (there lying) by the side of this a Marîcha tree with an ant-hill at the meeting place of the (three) villages Khônna, Tônêngi, and Khôllira. To the south, a big ant-hill, to the west of which (there are) rows of forests and by the side of this after crossing a watercourse, a boundary stone, fixed, and next, three boundary stones, fixed in order. To the south-west, a boundary stone to the north of which (there is another) boundary stone and after this, a boundary stone near a tamarind tree below the causeway of î(ra ?)ṇidala and after this, the mouth of the watercourse joining a tank and by the side of this, a boundary stone fixed on the bank of the watercourse. Then the western boundary follows the watercourse and turning a small bend and crossing the same watercourse and again going northwards, meets a boundary stone, fixed between two watercourses at the meeting place of the (three) villages Khônna, Tuluvu, Gâra. To the north, a causeway connecting two tanks. To the north-east, a watercourse of the village, Tônêngi and the meeting place of the (three) villagesKhônna, Gâra and Ombaravêlli.

(130-136) There are four, of the usual imprecatory verses.

(136-138) The author of the text is Sâsanâdhikârî jatavêdi bhaṭṭa. The engraver is battênâchârya, son of Vallênâchârya.

BHAVABHUTI AND HIS IDENTITY.

By Mimansakacharya, S. K. Ramanatha Sastriar,

(Formerly Lecturer in Mîmānsa, Āndhra Gîrvāṇa Vidyālaya Kovvûr, West Gôdāvari District.)

Translated from the Original Sanskrit

By M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M. A.

Sometimes we wonder that certain persons are known only by surnames or even curiously by their nicknames. Akbar means great and it is a title to Emperor Mahomed Jalâluddîn the Great. The poet, probably Govindarâja, was termed *Vikaṭanitambâ* for the powerful deliniation of the character of a temptress, Vikaṭanitambâ, the heroine of the farce. Bhavabhûti, Bhâravi, perhaps Kâlidâsa and a host of scholars live by their pseudonyms alone. We propose to go into the real name of Bhavabhûti whose scholarship and poetic genius warrant such an inquiry.

In *Mâlatîmâdhava* some praise is bestowed upon the sastric scholarship of Bhavabhûti in prologue and in addition the poet consoles himself in a memorable verse against probable indifference to his work. What his works were in sastras is the common inquiry of our day. A few decades ago the editor of *Gaudavadha* drew the attention of scholars to certain colophons to *Malatîmâdhava* which speak of one Umbêka, a pupil of Kumârila, as the author of that drama. Later on Mr. M. R. Telang in his introduction to *Mahâvidyâvidambana* pointed out that Chitsukha refers the author of *Mâlatîmâdhava* as an *apta* and that the commentator identifies Umbêka as the author cited and he was no other than Bhavabhûti (Vide *Tattvapradîpika*, page 265.) The commentary on *Sâstradipika* called *Yuktisnehaprapûrani* frequently cites Umbêka in criticising Pārthasārathi's opinions on *Chodana* and *autpattica* sûtras. (vide pp 3, 38, 82, 135 &c) Mādhava Saraswati in his *Sarvadarsanakaumudi* expressly states that Umbêka wrote a commentary on *Slôkavartika*. The following verse,

उम्बेकः कारिकां वेत्ति तन्त्रं वेत्ति प्रभाकरः

मण्डनस्तूभयं वेत्ति नोभयं वेत्ति रेवणः

is current among scholars in Malabar though a different reading is given by Haribhadra. This would mean that Umbêka must have written about the *Slôkavartika* of Kumārila. *Tantra* means the portion covered in *Tantravartika*.

Now comes the difficulty. It is said in *Sankaravijaya* of Sri Vidyāraṇya that Sankara went to Maṇḍana Miśra who was otherwise called Umbêka and Viśvarupa. He defeated him in disputations and Maṇḍana accepted *Sannyasa-asrama.* If this is true Bhavabhûti being Umbêka, the other two names must refer to him Maṇḍana became Surêśvara in *sannyasa-asrama* Maṇḍana seems to be a different person. A number of commentators on Mîmānsa and Vedānta works cited Umbêka's opinions as authoritative and final. Recently Dr. Ganganatha Jha has published Umbêka's commentary on Bhāvanāvivêka of Maṇḍana.

To add to this, Bhavabhuti is known in his dramas as the bearer of the title Srîkaṇṭha. The author of *Saiva bhashya* on the Brahma sutras is known as Srîkaṇṭha. We know that a sect of Saivites were known by the name of Srîkaṇṭhas whose seat lay at the Sriśaila in Kurnul district. An examination into this amusing identity of names must surely lead us into the untraversed regions of Mîmānsa and Vêdānta. There are works available under the authorship of all these names individually. Maṇḍana's three *vivekas* (Vidhivivêka, Bhāvanāvivêka, Vibhramavivêka) and two *Siddhis* (Sphoṭa and brahma siddhis) are well known with a train of commentaries thereon. His gloss on Sābara Bhāshya is not seen by me. Bhavabhuti's dramas proclaim that name. Sureśvara's three grand works still hold their day in elucidating Sankara's terse lines. Viśvarupa is a commentator on the Smṛti of Yāgnyavalkya and his voluminous work is now available in print. Umbêka's commentary on *Bhāvanaviveka* is already published. Srîkaṇṭha's bhāshya is studied by its followers. Thus an examination of these works is really onerous if not quite amusing.

Kumārila wrote five works of which *Brihattîka* and *Madhya vartika* have perished. They are cited by Pārthasārathi in his works and by Mādhava-sarasvati in his *Sarvadarsana-kaumudi.* Krishnadêva also mentions these names. Kâmārila's *Slôkavartika* which consists of 33000 slôkas extends over *Tarkapada* of Mimānsa. I have recently obtained a copy of Umbêka's commentary on *Slokavartika* extending over 2000 slokas and the work was continued by Bhaṭṭaputra Jayamiśra. We are tempted by the mode of commenting, to say that jayamiśra must have been the son of Kumārila who is known as Bhaṭṭa. If Jayamiśra was the son of Kumārila, Umbeka being the author of the earlier part of the work must be his contemporary. The colophons of *Malatimadhava* referred to above speak of him as Kumārila's pupil. The work begins with the slôka in *Malatimadhava* declared as memorable.

E nāma kecidiha nah pratbayantyavagnām
Jānantu te kimapi tān prati naisa yatnah,

Utpatsyatê mama tu kôpi samānadharmah
Kalo hyayam niravadhir = vipula ca prthvi,

He means perhaps that his commentary should struggle against a host of opponents as Prabhākara, Murāri, and *Advaitins* as Sankara &c. Umbeka left it at *Vanavada* and Jayamiśra continued therefrom perhaps with greater vigour. His exposition is full and invariably points to the opponent against whom the argument was aimed. Why should Umbêka abandon his task in the middle? *Mahavîracharita* is likewise incomplete. The hand of Death sometimes carried away a number of great men as Bāṇa, Daṇḍin, Kalidāsa, Paṇḍitarāya &c., even with the brush in their hands retouching the fairest of their creations. Was Bhavabhûti a victim of the same hand?

Viśvarûpa's commentary on Yāgnyavalkya smriti is again annotated by a scholar who as an auspices to the commencement of his work praises Viśvarupa thus;—

यत्प्रसादायं लोको धर्ममार्गस्थित: सुखी
भवभूतिसुरेशाख्यं विश्वरुपं प्रणाम्यतम्

It evidently means that Bhavabhuti was Viśvarupa and also Sureśvara. A manuscript copy of *Naishkarmya-siddhi* reads in its colophon that the pupil of Govinda-bhagavatpāla, namely, Viśvarupa wrote the work. The former, we know, was the *guru* of Sankara. This means that the name Viśvarupa must signify his sannyāsihood. The name Sureśvarā seems to be a title, as some tradition declares. If this is true we have no difficulty in supposing that Umbêka having entered a new life with a promise to comment upon Sankara's works and to complete *his* mission must have necessarilly abandoned his *kavya* and his labours in *karma-mîmânsa*. Some scholars are led to think that Dêvêśvara, the *guru* of Sarvagnātman was Sureśvara. Neither Sarvagnātman nor his several commentators ever meant Sureśvara as a synonym of Dêvêśvara. The archaeological researches in Travancore give a later date to Manukulāditya, the patron of Sarvagnātman than that of Sureśvara.

So far, it is pointed out that records identify Umbêka with Bhavabhuti, Viśvarupa and Sureśvara. Was Maṇḍana same as Surêswara? The only work which identifies them is *Sankaravijaya* ascribed to Vidyâraṇya. Vyâsagiri whom Vidyaraṇya professes to follow has no mention of Maṇḍana. Neither Govinda, the author of *Achâryavijaya* and a Kerala by birth does, but he says that Viśvarupa was defeated by Sankara and he became Sureśvara. A close examination of the works of Maṇḍana and Sureśvara and a host of commentaries thereon reveal that there are doctrinal differences between them. Umbêka is held as Surêśvara and as a commentator·

of Maṇḍana's *Bhavanaviveka,* Maṇḍana cannot be indentified with Suresvara. The chief arguments adduced against the identity of Maṇḍana with Suresvara are (1) that in a commentary of *Sankshepa-sarîraka*, Maṇḍana's doctrine was condemned and that of Sureśvara was accepted, (2) that Vidyâsâgara in his commentary on *Pancha-padika* called *Tikaratna* contrasts the two schools, one of Maṇḍana-Vâchaspati and another of Vimuktâtman who, we know, generally follows Surêśvara, (3) that a commentator on *Naishkarmyasiddhi* of Surêśvara in dealing with *aparokshagñana* criticises the school of Maṇḍana and Vâchaspati which he considers as dull or worthless, and in support of his argument quotes verse from *Brahmasiddhi* of Maṇḍana, (chapter IV) (4) that Maṇḍana holds the *Gnana-karma-samucchaya* theory wile Sankara and Sureśvara discard *karma* entirely (5) that Maṇḍana upholds the theory of *sphota* along with the school of Bhartṛhari, while Sureśvara with both the Mimansa schools cannot accept it, (6) that Vâchaspati, the strong advocate of Maṇḍana's school has not condescended to comment upon the works of Suresvara, who according to Anandagiri was later than Surêśvara for in *Vartika* 1103 page 7, Vāchaspati was meant as among त्रैय्यन्तनिष्ठिता and that Vāchaspati, as he differed in *sphôta* theory, wrote his own work, instead of amplifying Maṇḍana's *Sphotasiddhi*. Such arguments as these can be easily multiplied by a close comparison of their theories.

On the otherhand, those who maintain their identity are not altogether helpless. For a greater portion of Brahmasiddhi of Maṇḍana was devoted to defeat the theories of Prabhākara and most curiously, the whole of it is reproduced in *Sambandhavartika* by Sureśvara with additional arguments here and there which simply answer the objections of Sālikanātha raised against Brahmasiddhi, in his Ṛjuvimalā and Prakaraṇapanchikā. There are certain verses which are common to *Brahmasiddhi* and *Vartika* apart from the same order of the arguments. If Surêśvara were different from Maṇḍana, his adaptation of *Brahmasiddhi* would border on plagiarism and cannot be creditable to a poet and scholar, and pupil of Kumārila. The differences in views of Maṇḍana and Surêśvara may be accounted for by the extraordinary influence of Sankara's doctrines upon Surêśvara which secured his spiritual transformation.

Thus the records are favourable to the identity of Bhavabhuti with Umbêka, Sureśvara, Viśvarupa, but with Maṇḍana we have yet to hesitate to accept.

Srîkaṇṭha's Bhāshya presents certain features which induce one to suppose that Sankara improved upon many a theory of that author. The celebrated *pucchabramhavâda* is an instance of that kind.

Bhavabhuti's title of *Srikantha*[1] is not meaningless. The opinions of Umbêka on the subject of *advaita* are clear even in his Mimansa commentary. We propose to enter fully into this phase of question when we deal with Prabhākara in our introduction to *Brhati*. Chitsukha calls Umbeka as an *Apta* which, as a sastric term must mean a *bhashyakara*.

The dates of these writers fall between 680 and 750 A. D.

1 It has been held recently that Srîkantha or Nîlakantha was later than Ramanuja. Kshemaraja in his commentary on Abhinavagupta's Pratyabhijñavimarsika quotes Srîkantha's lines. Srîkara, who is frequently mentioned by Srîdhara, the author of Nyayakundali and Kaumudî, quotes from Srikantha-bhashya. Srîkantha once belonged to a separate Saiva sect whose seat lay at Srisaila. Hence Srîkantha-bhashya cannot be later than A. D. 900. (Translator.)

WHO WERE THE SULIKAS.

By. Rev. H. HERAS, S. J., M. A.

In the Haraha inscription of Iśânavarman it is said that this king vanquished in battle the Sûlikas (1) Pandit Hirananda Sastri, M. A., who first published the inscription, made the following remarks about this name: "Sûlika appears to be a new name, and I am not aware of any other epigraphic reference to it. Possibly it is identical with the Saulika of the *Brhatsamhitâ* and the *Mârkandêyapurâna* and is to be located in the south-east along with Kalinga, Vidharba, Chedi, etc." (2) Mr. Nanigopal Majumdar had previously written about this word of the inscription as follows: "Who the Sûlikas were is also not known. According to Fleet, they are identifiable with the Mûlikas" (3) Indeed, Fleet says that perhaps the correct reading of Maulika and Mûlika is Saulika and Sûlika (4). But when his list reaches Saulika and Sûlika he repeats that perhaps their correct reading is Maulika and Mûlika (5) This shows that Fleet's opinion was a mere conjecture not well founded. Anyhow he says that they are a people in the north-western division'. These Mûlikas have also been called Mulakas. Dr. H. C. Raychaudhury suggests that the Sulikas were perhaps the Chalukyas, Sulikas being only a variant like Chalikya, Solaki and Solanki (6) But Mr. Aravamuthan rightly objects that 'we know of no Chalukyan king who could have been worsted by the Maukharis' (7) The people I am going to suggest could have been defeated by the Maukharis.

The same Mr. Aravamuthan has in a masterly way disclosed the unknown fact of several Dravidian expeditions into the Aryan kingdoms of the North. One of the kings who led such expeditions was the greatest Choḷa king Karikâlaṉ. He is said to have invaded North India as far as the Himâlays and conquered the kingdom of Magadha (8) Prescinding from the date of this invasion, it is certainly true that Karikâlaṉ considered the Maukhaṛi king as one of his feudatory princes, though the latter was not willing to obey his

(1) Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 120, v. 13.
(2) H. Satri, Haraha Inscription of the reign of Isanavarman, Ibid. p. 112.
(3) Majumdar, A Haraha Stone-Inscription, I. A; XLVI, p. 127.
(4) Fleet, The Topôgraphical List of the Brihat-Samhita, I. A, XXII, p. 185 and 186 J. A. S. B (N. S.) XVII, p. 319 note 6.
(5) Ibid., p. 189 and 190.
(6) Raychaudhury
(7) Aravamuthan, The Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age, p. 98.
(8) Aravamuthan, o. c., p. 4.

commands (1) This intercourse between the Cholas and the Maukharis, so long forgotten, seems to give a solution to the doubts which have risen as regards the meaning of the word Sûlikas. Chola, a purely Tamilian name, csuld not appeal to the Aryan mind of the northeners, and was slowly but naturally converted into Sûlika, a thoroughly Sanskrit name (A pike bearer), which, moreover depicted the invaders with their long pikes ready to enter the battle. This circumstance, and the detail mentioned in the inscription (*viz*, that they had an army of countless galloping horses') seem to agree with the descriptions of battles between the Cholas and their enemies both in the *Mahâvamsa* (2) and in the *Kalingattuparani*. (3) This last poem mentions the soldiers of the Chola Emperor Kulottunga bearing spears or pikes. The Chola inscriptions speak also of the great and well equipped armies of these rulers. In one of them, for instance, the Tirukkalukkunram inscription of Kulottunga I, the campaigns of this prince are described in detail. (4) In these inscriptions we find often mentioned the city of Kollipakkai, one of the most important cities of the Chola kingdom, the walls of which are said to be surrounded by *sûlli*(5)

The change of the name Chola into Sûlika is not philologically improbable. The Parsis are similarly called Paraśikas in Sanskrit inscriptions. Moreover the Cholas are called Cholians in the *Mahâvamsa;* and the च is often changed into श in the inscriptions (6).

The identification of the Sûlikas with the Cholas is of the utmost importance as far as history is concerned. The defeat inflicted on the Sûlikas by Iśânavarman might probably mark the end of the Tamilian domination over the kingdom of Magadha. We know moreover that Iśânavarman is the first Maukhari to whom the title of Mahârâjadhirâja is applied (7) To free his kingdom from the Chola sway was evidently the first step to attain this overlordship over the North of India.

(1) Ibid., p. 14. Cf. JA., XIX, p. 331.
(2) Mahavamsa. (Wijesinha's translatiôn) p. 74-5 82-3. 206, etc.
(3) Kanakasabhai Pillai, Tamil Historical Texts, J. A., XIX, p. 332-6
(4) S. I. I., III, p. 147.
(5) Ibid., II, p. 108, 221, 403, III, p. 432.
(6) S. I. I., III, p. 134, 135, 136, 140, 142, 154, 158, 162, 186, 190, 200, etc.
(7) Asirgadh Seal inscription of Sarvavarman, Fleet, Gupta Inscriptions, p. 221.

ANCIENT SOUTH INDIAN GOLD COINAGE.

By R. SRINIVASA RAGHAVA IYENGAR, M. A.

When we examine the system of Coinage of Ancient India we find that the South Indian System presents a peculiar feature. From the coins that have been discovered as Treasure-Trove we find that the South Indian coins are entirely different from those of the north and gold coins of the smallest denomination appeared to have been issued to a large extent by kings of old. Gold coins of the weight of 5 to 6 grains, 2½, 1¼, and ¾ grains were issued having some design or other on both sides in some cases and on one side only in others. They are so small that it is very dfficult to handle them. Generally coins were used in order to get the necessaries of life, to obtain things that we had not on had, for fines levied by kings, for free gifts, for *dakshinas* in religious ceremonies and for various other purposes. If these small coins had been intended for purchasing household articles etc., the then people would have found it very difficult to preserve and handle them. They would have chosen bigger coins in baser metals, such as, silver or copper. When we read the law codes composed by Manu and Yâgnavalkya we learn that the fines imposed by kings were paid by Karshapanams which were coins in copper. So these small coins should have been issued for a different purpose. We shall now find what was their object in issuing such small coins.

In all Aryan household, religious ceremonies played a very important part and every ceremony could not be conducted without paying *Dakshinas* to those who had officiated in them. It was also enjoined that such *dakshinas* should be given in gold as silver was considered inauspicious. In all vedic ceremonies dakshinas were given by means of gold pellets known by the name of SVARNA. When coinage was introduced these SVARNAS were replaced by coins. The authority for this was taken from the Vedas. There is a passage in the *Krishna Yajurveda* I *Kanda* 5th *Prapataka* I *Anuvaka* from which we gather that it is very inauspicious to give away silver as *dakshina*.

The story runs thus. "There was a battle between the Devâs and the Asuras. Devas became victorious and deposited with Agni (God of Fire) for safety the treasures and precious stones which they got from Asuras. They did so in the hope of using them when they were in need. But Agni wanted to appropriate the whole lot for himself and so ran away with them. The Devas coming to know of this, pursued and caught hold of him and beat him severely. Agni wept

when he could not bear the beating of the Devas. The tears that fell from his eyes became silver. As silver was the outcome of tears it was considered inauspicious to give it as *Dakshina* on auspicious occasions. If anyone were to give silver as *dakshina* in any sacrifice his house will be visited by an inauspicious event within a period of one year".

As Vedas forbid giving away silver it became a matter of necessity to give away gold in all religious ceremonies. Thus religion played a great part in determining the coinage of the country. The kings of old had in their ministers very profound sanskrit scholars. Instances may be cited of Hêmâdri and Vidyâranya. The former was the minister of the Yâdava kings of Devagiri and the latter was the minister of the Vijayanagara kings. They were all profound scholars and they should have influenced the kings to issue gold coins for the benefit of the people. Kings had minting places and there was a separate establishment for minting coins. In order that gold might be accessible both to the rich and the poor, coins of small denominations of ⅛, ¼, ½ fanams were minted and made available for people to enable them to use them in religious ceremonials.

My father had four gold pellets called Sakkaraipanams and used to give them as dakshinas on Sraddha occasions. Before the guests departed they were given the contemplated amounts and these pellets got back. Unfortunately these have been lost now.

The coins that have been discovered are described below:—

1. *GANGA FANAMS.* These were issued by the kings of Kalinganagara.

Obverse. Caparisoned bull standing facing the proper left with a crescent of the moon above.

Reverse. Sam. 14.

W. 5.25; S. 0.3.

do. One-eighth fanams.

Obverse. Same.

Reverse. Same.

W. 0.75; S. 0.2.

2. *MATSYA FANAMS.* These were issued by the chiefs of that name who were ruling the country comprising the district of Vizagapatam (during the XIV and XV centuries.)

Obverse. Two fishes.

Reverse. Sam, 12.

W. 5.5; S. 0.35.

do. (Quarter fanams).

Obverse. Two fishes.
Reverse. Sam. 5.
W. 1.25; S, 0.25.

3. *OLD FANAMS.* Found as Treasure Trove in Trichinopoly and Tinnevelly districts.

Obverse. Figure like the letter U with a dot inside and with the sun and moon on either side. Some peculiar design made up of lines and dots. The whole may be taken to represent a crude form of Kali.
Reverse. 12 dots arranged in 3 rows of 4 each and straight lines; one straight line at right angles to the other. The sun and moon on either side,
W. 5.5; S. 0,4.

4. *VIRARAYA FANAMS.* There are 16 varieties of these and they were found as Treasure Trove in the districts of Coimbatore, North Kanara, Kistna, Chingelput, Cuddappah, Tanjore, Godavari, Madura, North Arcot, South Arcot, Malabar, Salem, Nellore, and Coorg.

Obverse. The letter U with some other symbols.
Reverse. 12 dots with some other figure.
W. 5.6; S. 0.3 to 0.4.

5. *GARUDA FANAMS.*

Obverse. A flying Garuda.
Reverse. A figure resembling the Vaishnavite caste-mark.
W. 5.6; S. 0.3 to 0.4.

6. *NAMAM FANAMS.*

Observe. Vaishnavite castemark.
Reverse. In some cases it is blank; in some a legend not read.
W. 5. 25; S. 0.2 to 0.4.

7. *CHOLA FANAMS.* Issued by Kulottunga Chola I.

Obverse. "SUNG" in Tamil script and Regnal year.
Reverse. Tiger, bow, and other indistinct marks.
W. 5.5; S. 0.4.

8. *REDDI FANAMS.*

Obverse. Bull couchant with the sun and the moon above with a few dots.
Reverse. Elephant goad, coiled whip, and the sun and the moon.
W. 5.25; S. 0.25.

do. (Quarter fanams.)

Obverse. do.

Reverse. do.

W. 2.5; S.

9 *SOUTH INDIAN FANAMS.*

Obverse. Devanagari legend "PATA" "PRADHANA".

Reverse. Blank.

W. 2.25; S. 0.2.

10. *do.* *Obverse.* Vishnu standing.

Reverse. Man and a lamp.

W. 5.5; S. 0.27.

do. (Quarter fanams,)

Obverse. Peculiar fiigure made up of lines.

Reverse. A circle and an angle made up of lines and dots.

W. 1.5; S. 0.2.

11. *ANANTARAMAN FANAMS.* Issued by the kings of Travencore.

Obverse. A floral design.

Reverse. 12 dots representing the signs of the zodiac with some lines.

W. 5.25; S. 0.3.

ANANTARAMAN HALF FANAMS.

Obverse. do.

Reverse. do.

W. 2.5; S. 0.22.

12. *DAGGER FANAMS.*

Obverse. Dagger.

Reverse. Heart-shaped device, 12 dots, the sun and the moon.

W. 5 to 5.25; S. 0.25 to 0.4.

13. *SIVAJI FANAMS.* Issued by Sivaji the Great.

Obverse. "CHATRA" "PATI" } In Devanagiri.

Reverse. "VI" "RAJA" } In Devanagiri.

W. 5.25; S. 0.2.

14. *RAMARAYAN FANAMS.* Issued by Rama Raja the second son of Sivaji the Great.

Obverse. Rude figure of the king.

Reverse. "RAMA" "RAU" } In Devanagiri.

W. 5.25; S. 0.25 to 0.3.

From all these cases quoted above it is clear that the kings of old did issue gold coins even in the lowest denomination. While the

fanams were weighed 5 grains which would have then have cost 4 annas 1/4 and 1/8 of these would have cost one anna and half an anna respectively.

Even the Moghul Emperors Aurangazeb, Jahander Shah, Farruksiyar, Muhammad Shah, Ahmed Shah, Alangir II and Shah Alam II struck *varahas* and half *varahas* and half *fanams* in the mints established at Gutti *IMTIYAZGARH*, [1]*TADPATRI*, and *CUDDAPPAH*. These issues are peculiar to South India and were not struck for use in Northen India. These should evidently have been struck to satisfy the needs of the Indian people.

HALF FANAMS. *Obverse*. Name of the Emperor.

Reverse. The name of the Mint town and year (A.H.)
W. 2.5; S. 0.2.

1 A paper on this new mint will appear in thh numismatic supplement to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

COINS OF KAVALIYADAVALLI TREASURE TROVE CASE

BY R. SRINIVASA RAGHAVA IYENGAR, M. A.

In September 1921, while some men were grazing their cattle on a hillock near the village or Kavaliyadavalli, Atmakur taluk, Nellore District, they were attracted by the glitter of metal and on close examination discovered some coins on a slab in a potshred. They are sixteen in number, four big and twelve small ones. These have been discovered for the first time and are of some interest and a closer study of them is likely to give valuable information to the history of Numismatics.

By the size, shape and weight and the legend and other marks found on them they group themselves under different heads.

Class I. These consist of three big gold coins, which are nearly of the same diameter only varying from 0.78 to 0.82 of an inch and are of the same weight 55 grains each. The metal is 13 carats fine. They are roundshaped and are of the well-known Padmatanka type. They are somewhat cupshaped and bear various punchmarks on the surface, the most prominent of which is the symbol 'Sri in old Telu-gannada script on either side of the periphery at the ends of the horizontal diameter. At the top of the vertical diameter is found in old Telugu script a legend which reads as (Ra)yasa' and a portion of 'ma' in coin No. 1, as 'yasamu' in coin No. 2, and as 'sama' in coin No. 3. Putting these three together, we get a fairly intelligible and complete legend 'Rayasamu.' At the bottom of the vertical diameter is found a symbol which may be taken to represent a crown. Besides, there are a few indistinct impressions in the interspaces which perhaps were intended to represent lions. The reverse is blank.

The term 'Rāyasamu' ordinarily indicates 'clerkship[1]. Of course the legend cannot be supposed to mean only clerkship. So it should have a more appropriate meaning. We find that during the Vijayanagar period the viceroys enjoyed the title of 'Rāyasam.' After the conquest of Udayagiri by Sri Krishna Dêva Raya, it was made a seat of a provincial Government. Rāyasam Timmarasayya

1 Rayasamu in Telugu, means ordinarily an order-and it originally meant an office of writer or Secretaryship under a King or Viceroy. Rayasam, also meant the officer who wrote down orders under orders from the King. Rayasam survives to-day in Anomamantry as a surname or a family name, which clearly indicates that the present families are the descendants of Rayasam of old: Rayasamu is also found in canarese language and means the same thing.—Ed.

and Rāyasam Kondamarusayya were viceroys there. Venkatappa was a viceroy during the reign of Achyuta Deva Mahārāya. Rāyasam Tirumalayya was a Governor under Sri Virapratāpa Dêva Rāya in śaka 1496. [1]Rāyasam Ayyappa was a Governor at Koṇḍavidu in saka 1453. Though all these viceroys enjoyed the title of Rāyasam, Kondamarusayya was the most powerful of them, so powerful that [2] he was even addressed as Maharaja. [3] He planted the Vijayanagara colours on the Simhadri and Srikurmam hills during Krishna Deva Raya's famous campaign in the north. [4]He conquered the Reddis who ruled at Chundi and annexed their territory. He was so powerful and enjoyed such great independence that in his own name he made several grants for the salvation of his master. If only the legend 'Rāyasamu' is to be our guide we may be tempted to conclude that these coins were issued by this powerful viceroy. But on paleographical grounds we have to assign these coins to an earlier date.

Again the shape and size are so dissimilar to the extent Vijayanagar type and are more like those issued by the later Chaulukyas of Kalyani and the Telugu Chola chiefs who ruled in parts of the districts of Cuddappah and Nellore. Further these coins bear a mark which is exactly the same as those found on coins of group X of the [5]Kodur Treasure Trove case which were ascribed to the Western Chalukya king Jagadikamalla. This mark was then thought to represent a temple, but on closer and more careful examination they seem to me to represent a crown. So far as our present knowledge goes there is no western Chalukyan king or any Telugu Chola chief who enjoyed the title of or had the name 'Rayasamu.' So unless and until we get further evidence from inscriptions or records which may be discovered in future we cannot ascribe these coins either to the Chalukya kings or to the Chola chiefs.

[6] Ambadeva of the Kayastha family was a feudatory of the Kākatiyas. He defeated several Telugu chiefs and overthrew Sripati Gaṇapati. Ambadeva usurped the Kākatiya throne in the interval between the reigns of Rudrāmba and Pratāpa Rudra Deva. After the overthrow of Sripati Gaṇapati, Ambadeva assumed the title of Rāyasahasramalla. It will be too far-fetched to suppose that our legend 'Rāyasamu' was a contraction of Rāyasahasramalla (rāya, for rāya, Sa for Sahasra, and Mu for Malla) and we know of no instances in which there have been such contractions in the case of legends. Upon

1. Mackenzie Mss. Book XVIII p. 104 & Local records Vol. 57, pp. 255-256.
2. Nellore Inscriptions, page 1264.
3. Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, Vol. I, pp. 7 & 8.
4. Nellore Inscriptions, pp. 478 & 479.
5. Madras G. O. No. 1106 (Home Dt. Misc.) dated 11—10—1917.
6. Madras Epigraphy Report for 1912, pages 76 & 77.

paleographical grounds we have to ascribe these coins to about the same period as that during which Ambadeva flourished. In shape size, weight and in the quality of the metal used these are very much the same as the one under Class II which, as will be seen later on, is identified as a Kākatiya coin which was current some fifty or sixty years before the period of Ambadeva Mahārāja. Hence it may be possible to hold that these coins were issued by Ambadeva who had for his model the earlier coins of the western Chalukyas of Kalyani or it may be that these legends were a second time impressed on the Western Chalukyan coins that existed before.

These are some of the possible theories which may be advanced as to the date and origin of these coins. But nothing definite can be said about them until as I said before, fresh and more assuring evidence is obtained.

Class II. There is but one gold coin in this class. It is almost round and has a diameter of 0.81 inch and weighs 56.25 grains. The metal is 13 or 14 carats fine. The symbol 'Sri' is found on either end of the horizontal diameter. At the top of the vertical diameter there is a legend (Ka)ti' and at the bottom 'gaṇa' in old Telugu script. The interspaces are filled by the figures of what may either be a lion or a tiger, with open mouth, raised paw, twisted tail, all these very crudely represented by dots and lines. The other side is blank.

There was a dynasty of Kākatiya kings which was short-lived though very powerful during that short period. It had its rise in the beginning of the 12th century. Gaṇapati was the greatest of the kings of this dynasty. We read from [1]'Ganapesvaram' inscription that he conquered the entire country of Velanaṇdu which extended from the borders of Guntur district to the modern Nellore. After subjugating the north he turned to the south and [2] extended his empire far into the interior of the Tamil country. This is evidenced by the [3]fact that one of his viceroys Sāmanta Bhoja at Kânchi granted the village of Kalattur to Ekambranatha temple at Kānchi for the salvation of his master. [4]From Motupalli inscription it appears that he extended his conquests as far as the Eastern coast. Inscriptions of this king are found in the Podili and Darsi taluks of the Nellore district and Ongole taluk of the Guntur district. Inscriptions of Pratapa Rudra Deva, another of Kākatiya kings are found in plenty in the taluks of Atmakur, Kandukur and Nellore, all which abundantly prove that the Kâkatîya empire embraced almost the

1. Ephigraphia Indica Vol. III, page 82
2. Madras Epigraphy Report for 1910, page 106.
3. Indian Antiquary Vol. 21, page 197
4. Madras Epigraphy Report 1910, page 107

18

whole of the modern Nellore district. Therefore the village of Kâvaliyadavalli in which this coin was discovered was presumably within the Kâkatîya kingdom.

It seems to be clear therefore that 'Kati' of our legend is a contraction of Kakati and represents Kakatiya. and Gaṇa. Gaṇapati the most powerful of the Kâkatîya kings. The name Kâkatiya is derived from Kâkati the name of the goddess whom they worshipped. This coin ought to be identified as the coin issued by Gaṇapati of the Kâkatîya dynasty and between the years of 1199 and 1260 A, D. as from inscriptions 181, 196, 213, 220, 194 and 196 of 1905 noted in Madras report on Epigraphy, we infer that Gaṇapati reigned during that period.

Sir Walter Elliot in his History of South Indian Coins says that in many of the seals of the grants and some coins of the Kâkatîya dynasty he found a bull couchant between two candelebra with an umbrella above and a chowrie on each side. Unfortunately he does not mention the names of the kings whose seals and coins he had examined, Nor are there anywhere any coins of the Kâkatîya dynasty answering to this description, In the seals of grants of Gaṇapati we do not find any bull, candelebra or umbrella. Instead, in the seal attached to the grant of Kolavennu by Gaṇapati we find a boar with the sun and moon. In the copper plate grant of the time of Gaṇapati noticed in page 122 of the Annual report on Epigraphy (Madras) for 1917, there is a seal which bears the emblems of a boar and a cow. [2] Verse 13 in the Ekambranatha inscription states that the Mudra (seal) of Gaṇapati was a boar. The [3] Mudra (seal) of Pratapa Rudra Deva was a boar. On the east face of the pillar on which the [4] Anumakonda inscription of Prola, grandfather of Gaṇapati, is engraved we find a jaina figure flanked by a cow and a calf on one side and a dagger and shield on the other. Thus the Mudra of Prola too contains a cow and we nowhere find a bull among the seals of grants or inscriptions of any of these kings. It is not therefore easy to understand how Sir Walter Eliot came to make the statement that the emblem of the Kâkatîyas was a bull.

However this may be, in the coin under investigation we find lions in and around the centre. From the foregoing discussion I have come to the conclusion that Gaṇapati's emblem was a boar. We usually find kings using on their coins the same emblems as they use for their seals in their grants and therefore it is a matter for con-

1. Catalogue of copper plate grants in the Madras Museum p. 26.
2. Indian Antiquary Vol. 21, page 200.
3. Prataparudriya by Vidyanatha, Kavyaprakarna, verse 10.
4. Epigraphia Indica Vo, IX page 256.

sideration how lions came to be in Gaṇapati's coins. It is very likely that he accepted coins that were current before his time and had his own name punched on them to indicate that he recognised them as legal tender. The formation of punch marks on the coins and the fact that a portion of the legend overlaps a portion of the lion show that the legends 'Kati' and 'Gana' were punched on old coins of kings who had lions for their emblem.

Class III. There are twelve gold coins in this class. They are all round with diameters varying from 0.4 to 0.45 of an inch weighing all alike 5.75 grains each. The metal is 13 carats fine. All these have the legend 'Sung' in old Tamil script on the obverse side. Just below the legend there is also a number in the same old Tamil script which very likely denotes the regnal year in which each was issued. On the reverse there is a bow, a tiger in sitting posture and some other symbols which are indistinct and are incapable of exact identification. In the case of one coin there is a legend 'Kānchi' and some other have 'Nē' in old Tamil Script. In some 'ne' is in an inverted form. Therefore these coins have to be subdivided into five different classes as under:—

(1)	Variety No. 1.	*Obverse.*	'Sung' 27
		Reverse.	Tiger, bow, and indistinct marks 'Kānchi'
(2)	Variety No. 2.	*Obverse.*	'Sung' 31
		Reverse.	Tiger, bow and some indistinct 'Ne'
(3)	Variety No. 3.	*Obverse.*	'Sung' 31
		Reverse.	Tiger, bow, some indistinct marks, 'Ne' inverted.
(4)	Variety No. 4.	*Obverse.*	'Sung' 31
		Reverse.	Tiger, bow, some indistinct marks.
(5)	Variety No. 5.	*Obverse.*	'Sung' 34
		Reverse.	Tiger, bow, some indistinct marks dots.

In the case of coins in which the numeral 31 appears there is also some mark which may be a simple line or portion of the Tamil letter 'r.' In either case it appears to be something distinct from the numeral and was perhaps intended to represent some symbol which is unfortunately indistinct and cannot be identified.

The emblems tiger bow and something else indistinct and the legend 'Sung' appear in all the coins. It is evident therefore that these coins have been issued by some king or kings of a dynasty which had for its emblem among other things the tiger and bow. The legend 'Sung' was very probably intended to denote the particular king who issued them. There can be no doubt that 'Kānchi' denotes the place from where or from whose mint that coins was issued. Kanchi was the popular name of the modern Conjeevaram which for many centuries was the seat of a king or viceroys. Hence the legend 'Ne' must also represent the contraction of the name of another place from which also coins were issued.

From the inscriptions and records we already possess, we know that the tiger was emblem of the Chôḷa dynasty, the bow the emblem of the Cheras and the fishes the emblem of the Pāṇḍyas. In the seal attached to the [1] Tiruvelangādu plates of Rajendra Chôla I we find the combination of all three emblems. During the reign of Rajendra Chola we know that all the three kingdoms Chera, Chola and Paṇḍya were brought under one sway. It is perfectly reasonable therefore to suppose that the Choḷas have added the emblems of the Cheras and the Paṇḍyans, to their own tiger, to proclaim the fact that they had conquered and annexed to their own the territories of the Cheras and the Pôiṇḍyans.

Chalukya Rajendra was from 1070 A.D. the ruler of the Eastern Chalukyan Kingdom Vengi which had for its capital Rājahmundry. He was adopted by Rajendra Chola as heir to his throne. Thus Chalukya Rājendra who assumed the title of Kulottunga Chôḷa Deva I became in 1070 A.D. the virtual ruler of the whole of the Chalukya and Chola empires extending from Vengi in the north to the extreme south. He conquered the kingdoms of Kerala, [2] Pāṇḍya, and Kuntala and extended his conquest as far north as Kalinga (modern Ganjam). He had his headquarters at Gangaikonda-cholapuram (Trichinopoly district) and continued to rule for at least fifty years.

Kâvaliyadavalli whence this find was discovered was once under the sway of Kulôttunga Chola I. During his reign he found that his subjects were groaning under heavy taxation and in order to give them relief abolished all *sungam*. '*Sungam*' in Tamil indicates taxes or tolls. His subjects were so very much overjoyed by this measure of relief, that they acclaimed their sovereign as [3] Sungam-tavirtta Kulôttunga Chola Deva. From that time forward he was

1 South Indian Inscriptions Vol III, Part III p 413, See plate attached.
2 Nellore Inscription page 826.
3. Inscription No. 377 of 1907. Madras Epigraphy Report.

known by the name of Sungamtavirtta Kulottunga Chola I. The legend 'Sung' must be a contraction of Sungamtavirtta (who has abolished tolls). It can only indicate that these coins were issued by this Sungamtavirtta Kulôttunga Chôḷa, otherwise the legend will be absolutely inexplicable.

I have already said that 'Kânchi' represents Conjeevaram, the place from which the coins were issued. 'Nê' must indicate Nellore. From inscriptions found in the district of Nellore we find there are frequent references made to a coin called MĀDAI. Mention is made of [1]Mâḍai from the interest of which a lamp was maintained in a temple during the 35th year of the reign of Kulôttunga I. From another [2]inscription we learn that there existed coins called 'Nellore Mâḍai', for we find that in the 3rd year of Allam Tirukkalâtti Gaṇḍa Gôpala Dêva, grants of Nellore mâḍai were made to a temple. From the above, it is clear that at one time or other, there was a mint at Nellore. So the legend 'Ne' must represent Nellore. The numerical figures 27, 31, and 34 are evidently the Regnal years of the King Kulottunga who issued them, for, we know that coins of the Ganga dynasty of Kalinganagara bear the impress of the regnal year in which they were issued.

We can therefore safely conclude that the coins in this class were all issued between the years 1070 and 1120 A. D. by Kulôttunga Chôḍa I and that they were minted some at Kânchi and others at Nellore.

In weight, they are very much equal to other South Indian fanams that we know of. Only these are a bit larger but thinner. Probably these were also called fanams in those days.

1. Neilore Inscription Page 835.
2. Inscription No. 300 of 1921, Madras Epigraphy Report.

DATE OF TENKANADITYA.

By VEMPARALA SUBRAHMANYAM, M.A., L. T.

Notwithstanding the controversial nature of Nannayabhattaraka's claim to be called the first Telugu poet, a correct determination of the age of Tênkaṇâditya, the author of *Kumârasambhava* in Telugu naturally leads one to tread that questionable ground. Nannaya is believed to be the first Telugu poet for the following reasons :—

(i). He alludes to no Telugu poet specifically in his *Mahâbhârata.*

(ii). Tikkana mentions that Nannaya was the author of the first three *parvas* in Mahabharata, but he alludes to no other Telugu poet.

(iii). All the subsequent Telugu poets speak of Nannaya as the first Telugu poet, and

(IV). Literary tradition also supports this view.

In all languages *Lakshanagranthas* are as a rule preceded by *Lakshya-granthas i. e.,* works of literary art are the forerunners of works of Grammar and language. The fact that Nannaya was the author of *Andhrasabdachintâmani*, the first known Telugu Grammar suggests the pre-existence of Telugu literature. His title *Andhrasabdasâsana* is, however, significant because he has sprung up as a literary dictator, who, out of the myriads of dialectical and other differences existing in his age, has successfully standardised the literary Telugu Dialect.

An examination of the longer inscription of the Amaravati stupa, now in the British Museum, proves that the Telugu alphabet was perfect even by that date. Though the text of that inscription is Sanskrit, the script in which it stands is Telugn with this difference, that those letters were of a square style with the vowel inflections by the left side of the letters as in Sanskrit, while our Modern Telugu characters are circular in style with the vowel inflcetions mostly at the head of the letter. Although historians differ as to the date of the inscription, all of them agree in holding that it belongs to a period three centuries before Nannaya.

The smaller inscription of the Amaravati stupa, which is now probably in the Calcutta Museum, helps us at least to conjecture the connection of the stupa with the Andhra kings, because of its probable reference to Yagnasri. The coins discovered in the excavations

of the Amaravati stupa throw also much light upon the history of the above dynasty. The identification of Amaravati or Amareswaram on the Krishna with Dhanakataka or Dharaṇikôta, the capital of the Andhra also strengthens our view that the stupa was a construction of the third century by Yagnasrî, the last Andhra king of renown who in all probabitity was a Budhist. He ruled from 184 to 213 A. D.

The application of the two terms Andhra and Telugu to the same language in modern times helps us to conjecture the absurdity of of holding that the histôrical Andhra Dynasty and the Andhra country between the Godavari and the Krishna which they were inhabiting were totally isolated from the present Telugu language. The use of the two terms '*Mârga*' and '*Dêsi*' in verse 23 of Telugu *Kumâra-sambhavam* by Tenkanaditya are explained as Sanskrit and Vernaculars by some scholars; but these terms are borrowed from Bharata's *Nâtyasastrâ;* the first implies the indication of *bhâva* by *abhinaya* or facial or other gestures; while the second indicates the expression of *bhava* in clear terms. These two expressions when applied to literature signify the ballad literature and works of poetic art respectively. There is therefore no reason to attribute *marga* to Sanskrit. So the verse means that while Telugu ballad literature including music was in existence before, the Chalukya kings from Satyasraya witnessed the birth of Telugu poesy. For reasons to be indicated elsewhere, Satyasraya is Pulakesa 1, Who ruled at Vātāpipurā from 550 A, D.

The Pallavas who were ruling before the Chalukyas were of the classical school and revived the Sanscrit language and Brahmanic religion. So during the Pallava predominance Telugu might have beed stagnant. The reference to the pre-existence of Telugu ballad literature must have been to the age of the Andhras who were ruling before the Pallavas. The fact that the Amaravati inscription is in the Telugu script strengthens this possibility. We may therefore conclude:—

(i) That Telugu or Andhram was the language of the Andhras the people of Andhradesa.

(ii) That during the rule of the Andhra Kings Telugu ballad literature and Telugu script were in use.

(iii) That both the language and literature were stagnant during the Pallava rule.

(iv) That during the Chalukyan period the birth of Telugu poesy was witnessed, and

(v) That Nannaya was the first to mould the modern Telugu literary and linguistic art.

Some telugu Scholars are of opinion that Nannechoda, the author of *Kumarasambhava* belongs to a time subsequent to that of

Nannaya and Tikkana. One of the reasons for this view is that Nannaya composes his *mangalaslôka* in Sanskrit while Nannechoda following Tikkana composed his *mangalaslôka* in Telugu. The conflicting nature of the evidence of the copper plate grants relating to Chodaballi, Father of Nannechoda is another reason for this misconception. Both Nannechoda and Tikkana belong to Nellore. So they might probably have followed the same Pâkanāti custom of commencing their *mangalaslôkâs* in Telugu while Nannaya being a literary critic might have begun his work with a sloka in the classical Sanskrit language. Later poets might have followed Tikkana from proximity, or on account of their love for the Vernacular. Others have placed Nannechoda between Nannaya and Tikkana.

Mr. M. Ramakrishna Kavi correctly holds that Nannechoda's time is prior to that of Nannaya, though he errs in the following respects:-

(i) In trying to bring in a battle between a Chola King and a Chalukeya King which has never been alluded to in the original text, and

(ii) In holding that that the epithet Tênkaṇâditya is a title of Nannechoda.

The prime cause of these misconceptions is the fact that instead of trying to concentrate their attention on the points alluded to in the main text, and to effect a compromise, our Scholars began to base their views on pure conjecture and created new problems instead of solving the existing ones.

The author of *Kumârasambhavam* enumerates many Sanskrit poets but does not mention even a single Telugu poet, though he states generally in his verse 23 that while Telugu balled literature *(Desikavita)* was in existence before, the Chalukya Kings from Satyâśraya downwards witnessed the birth of Telugu poesy. Satyâśraya as explained by some of our scholars is a title of Râjarâjanarêndra, the Eastern Chalukya King of Rajahmundry. This is certainly in agreement with the view that Rājarājanarendra, to whom the Telugu Mahabharata was dedicated, was the first patron of Telugu learning. But Satyâśraya was not at all mentioned in the Mahabharata as a title of Râjarâjanarêndra, though his other titles were alluded to. The rulers of the Imperial Western Chaluklya line namely Pulakesi 1. and Pulakesin 11. were alone called Satyāsraya Pulakesa Chakravartins. Pulakesin 1. ruled at Vatapi from 550 A. D. The phrase *'Satyasrayunï thotti Chalukya nrpul'* when translated means 'the Chalukya rulers beginning with Satyâśraya'. So Satyâsraya must be the first monarch of the dynasty. Râjarâjanarèndra was not the first of his line, and there is no indication for the application of

the title to Kubja vishṇuvardhana, the first of the Eastern Cholukya line. Even in the alternate reading suggested according to the Tanjore manuscript 'Châlukyarâju modaluga paluvur' the word 'Mothaluga, means 'beginning with'. This can in no way be inconsistent with the view taken above.

In verse 52, the poet describes that he belongs to the solar race of Kshatriyas, and alludes to (1). The sons of Sagara that dug a deep ditch from the earth's centre, (ii). Bhagîratha that brought the waters from the Heaven to the Earth and filled the Seas (iii). Râmachandra that bridged the sea between Râmeswara and Simhala, and (iv). Karikala Chola the great Chola ruler of the early years of the Christan era. He states that he equals in prowess either of them, whose power was only limited by the Seas, and styles himself Nannechoda. In verse 53 he states that he is the son of Chodaballi a lord of 21000 in Pakanadu, the present Nellore District and Srisati of the Haihaya dynasty. In verse 54 he states that Uṛaiyur was his capital and that he was Tênkaṇâditya.

A reference to the geneologies of the Cholas, prepared by Dr. S, Krishnaswamy Iyengar, M. A., in his South Indian History, clearly shows that there were only two rulers by name Aditya. (i). Aditya the founder of the new Chola dynasty in 880 A. D., and (ii). Rajaditya who was defeated and slain on the field by the Rāshṭrakûṭa King. Evidently, Mr. Ramakrishna Kavi identifies the atuhor of Kumârasambhava with the latter; this cannot be correct because his father was not Chodaballi but Parāntaka. Moreover his view cannot explain the situation because our authors' capital was Uṛaiyur while his father was a Pakanati chief. The mention of Karikalichola alone and the absence of any other name in the work indicates that there was no great ruler between Karikalan and our author. Had the founder of the new Chola dynasty, or Rājarāja the great, the Chola ruler who ruled from 985 to 1027 A. D., intervened between Karikalan and our author, there would certainly have been a reference to either of them in our work. A few generations after Karikala, the ancient Chola dynasty became extinct and its place was taken up by the Pallavas, Sivaskanthavarman, the Pallava ruler was predominant in South India from the Krishna to the Kaveri even as early as 150 A. D. When the Pallavas were totally weakened by the external attacks of the Rāshṭrakûṭas and by the internal struggles of the local dynasties, our author Aditya, the son of Chodaballi, a Pakanati chief, led his forces against Aparājita Pallava the last of the line, defeated him and overthrew his power. Then he re-established the new Chola dynasty at Uṛaiyur, the ancient Chola capital. This piece of historical information conclusively shows that Tênkaṇāditya cannot be taken as a title. It is the name of the conqueror. Literary tradition in the

Telugu country, and Andhra *lâkshanikas* speak of Tênkaṇāditya's *Kumârasambhava* and not of Nannechoda's *Kumarasambhava*. So Tê nka-ṇāditya must be taken as a name, in addition to his other name Choda-deva which the author is pleased to quote in the prose pieces or *gadyas* at the close of each canto or Asvasa.

Our author says that Uṛaiyur was his capital. The capital of the Imperial Chola dynasty under Karikala waa Uṛaiyur. But under the successors of Parāntaka, Tanjore seems to have been the capital. So our author might have ruled before this move to Tanjore. This move was made most probably in the later years of Parantaka's rule and so our author must have been a predecessor of Parantaka.

As there is a reference to Udhbhaṭa, the Sanskrit poet of Kashmir at the court of Jayâpîda in the work, *Kumârasambhava* cannot be the composition of a date earlier than 880 A. D., the date of *Udhbhata*. Since Āditya, the reviver of the Chola dynasty ruled from 880 to 900 A. D., it must have been composed during that age. Thus *Kumârasambhava* is of a very great historical and linguistic value as it throws much light upon the early history of Telugu language and literature, and as it indicates the direction from which the founder of the new Chola dynasty sprang forth, a point on which our University Prefessor of Indian History is silent.

SCOPE OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE AGENCY DIVISION.

By. R. SUBBRAO, M. A., L. T.,

PART II. *Chenchus.*

Huxley in his Anatomy of vertebrate animals divides the races of mankind into two divisions.

1. Ulotrichi or Woolly-haired.
2. Leiotrichi or Smooth-haired.

To the second division belong the Austroloid group in which the Dravidians and Pre-Dravidians of South India are included. Their features are described as follows:—dark skined, black haired. long prognathous skull, well developed brow ridges and dark eyes.

The Gonds, the Khonds, the Yanadies, the Koyas and the Chenchus all belong to the black strata.

It is now a matter of common historical knowledge that the aboriginal period was long prior to the Dravidian age. The jungle tribes still found in the Agency parts are clearly a Pre-Dravidian or aboriginal race.

Of all the wild tribes living in the Godavari Agency, the Chenchus are by far the most forward. They are a primitive tribe, of short stature, and of a high nasal index. The nose is thick and broad. They resemble the Yânâdis and may be said to belong to the same stock. They are a black detestable tribe and of idle, drunken, peevish, and blood-thirsty habits. Unlike the Khonds of Ganjam and the Koyas of Godavari Agency, they have few virtues to atone their vices. They have no liking for work and by nature are born lazy, wanting in intelligence. They are notorious for their stupid actions. Being drunken they are always addicted to thieving and to murdering. They are irritable and suspicious. They are a semi-wild, ignorant, plundering hill-tribe.

Their abode.

The Chenchus are mostly found in the Rampa Agency and occasionally one can see them in the plains to which they resort for trading purposes; but their stronghold is in the Nallamalai hills (Kurnool Dt.) where the wild and almost uncivilised and naked Chenchus can be found. The Chenchus are also found in small numbers in the coastal districts. These are semi-civilised people but

the wild Chenchus who live to the west of Ahobilam are averse to being civilised. They live in the woods and the wilds and in the caves and under trees. They live in huts made of rough bamboo wattle-work They carry like the Kôyas bows and arrows and are quick in getting up and down the hill slopes. It is proverbially told that it is far easier to catch a spotted deer than a wild Chenchu. But the tame Chenchus who are found living in the Godavari Agency paths and even in the plains are free from most of these vices and are accustomed to some honest work.

Their dress, habits and mode of life.

The wild Chenchus are simpletons. They are mostly "Naturals". Living in forests, they shun day light and the company of outsiders. They live in small hamlets or *gûdems* scattered here and there in wild forests of the Nallamalais or the Agency tracts. Their dress is very simple, for, wild Chenchus clothe themselves with leaves or rags and live on sago or bamboo rice. The Chenchus who live in the plains are tame and semicivilised and wear a loin cloth. The Chenchu women in the coastal districts are generally found to be wearing an under and upper wear. The chenchus as a class present a very ugly appearance. Being idle and lazy by nature, they do not like to cultivate land even to the extent to which the Köyas and other aboriginal tribes of the Agency parts do. They take to plunder when they fail to get sufficient food in the forests. The Wild Chenchus live on roots, honey, wild fruits, game and all eatable forest produce. When these are not found in plenty they levy black-mail on the villages close by and in cases of opposition, they do not hesitate to loot or even kill the people. Very often, they spoil crops by cutting or burning them, Dacoity and murders are too often caused by their wanton cruelty. Wild Chenchus living in the Nallamalai hills are often reported to burn the forests, poison the streams and commit assault and even murder in cases where the forest or police officers would attempt to interfere with their natural freedom. With a view to pacify the wild Chenchus, the Government are said to have granted certain rights to them; for instance, the right to use the forest produce for home consumption is granted. The forest produce comprises of several items:- Timber, bamboos, fiber, grass, roots, fruits, honey, wax and game. They are also allowed to fish and hunt in the forest and to graze their cattle and goats in the forests freely and even to barter minor forest produce but these rights which are granted by Government to pacify their wild nature are generally abused. The Chenchus as already described above are an admittedly ambitious, greedy and fickle-minded people who hate all outside interference with their natural rights. They know not of any outside control and hence look upon the government with suspicion and dislike, They

sell away valuable timber or otherwise commit breaches of discipline and when punished attempt to revolt. Hence, of late, attempts are made by government to civilise the Chenchus. Schools are established for imparting primary education and the Chenchus are employed as *Talayaries* to prevent dacoities. Further, they are employed as forest servants to guard forest produce, but it is admitted that the task of taming the Chenchus is almost an impossible feat. Attempts to teach the Chenchus settle down to cultivate the lands have proved futile. The Chenchu is naturally fond of drink and likes to thieve because a single night's theft makes him rich and luxurious for several days. The Chenchus living in the coastal districts are in some cases subject to police vigilance just like the Yânâdies. Sometimes, some of the wild clans migrate to the plains and attempt to commit theft.

Village life:—

The Chenchus live in hamlets or *gûdems* which are built within short distances of a mile or two. In a gûdem, the huts are built in the shape of a bee-hive. The *gùdems* are built close to a grove and near to some mountain stream. Several clans or families live in a village and often it is the people of the same clan that live together. Both the men and women also work for their food. In the day time they resort to the forest to collect food materials. By the evening they all return and the gudem would look very active. Life in a gudem is not one of unbroken peace, for, on account of their idleness and drunken habits they take to quarrelling, Some of these quarrels arise suddenly and result in bloodshed and often even in loss of life. Under the influence of arrack prepared out of *ippa* or *mowha* leaf and in evil company they often go out and indulge in drunken boasts and wild talks which result in danger to life. Very often in the night they go out in small parties and commit dacoities and even murders. Another cause of the quarrel is supplied by women. Cases of immorality are general and these lead to brawls which, too, end in bloodshed. The least provocation is enough to cause suspicion which leads to assault. The Chenchu like the Kôya is strong in his bow and arrow and when he shoots he does so very succussfully.

Their Marriage Customs:—

The Chenchus like the Kôyas are accustomed to two ways of marriage. The first is by consent, i.e., where the parents agree to the match, the marriage takes place in the bride-groom's house. A circular space of ground is cleaned with cow-dung. The bow and arrow are placed there-in, and the couple march round to the accompaniment of a drum three times. The assembled relatives throw rice on the head of the couple and the marriage is said to be complete. A feast and a dance give the finish. The Bride-groom gives new

clothes to the bride and arrack to the assembled relatives. A marriage ceremony generally costs about 7 or 8 rupees. In some cases, a priest is engaged and an auspicious day fixed, when a raised ground is formed and cleaned with cow-dung; and then the couple would be seated thereon. A *tali* is tied by the bride-groom round the neck of the bride. The relatives sprinkle rice on the heads of the couple and this would complete the marriage. As usual, a feast and a dance follow in the night. In some cases, as where the bride-groom and the bride fall in love with each other, they retire from the *gûdem* for one night and return next day when the parents of the bride-groom invite the relatives, give a feast and complete the marriage by throwing rice on the heads of the couple.

The second form, is marriage by force. Sometimes, a girl who may or may not be betrothed to another is carried off and then the offender will have to pay a heavy price for his offence. The elders of the *gûdem* meet and settle the amount of fine which is often spent for their common drink and revelry. Some times the fine is paid to the party that has suffered. Where the fine is not paid or where the parties do not come to an amicable settlement, the matter becomes a blood-feud between the two classes. The feuds often end in the murder of the weaker party. Where the feud is settled amicably, as a proof of sincere settlement, a blaze of fire is caused on a tree to denote extinction of the previous bitter feelings. Where the complainant does not agree to the terms, the matter becomes a matter of blood-feud between the two clans.

There is divorce among the Chencus. If the wife refuses to live with her husband but if the husband desires to have her, he will try to take her by force even by shedding the blood of her parents. In such cases, as far as possible, the woman's parents may ask for divorce on payment of betrothal expenses. Then the matter is referred to a *panchayat* i.e., a body of five elderly Chenchus who should act as arbitrators. The members of the Panchâyat receive a small fee for their drink and their decision is generally final. The Panchâyatdars assemble the members of the rival parties, listen to all the acrimonious charges and the replies given there to by the accused, and pronounce an oral judgment, which would generally be respected and obeyed.

Widow re-marriage is allowed and generally the younger brother of the deceased has a prior claim to marry the widowed sister-in-law. As usual, the tying of *tali* and wristlet made of leaves, the worshipping of bow and arrow and finally the sprinkling of the rice on the heads of the married couple by the assembled relatives form the essential parts of the marriage ceremony. A feast consisting of raw flesh, nuts, fruits, and arrack is held in the night and is followed by a dance which consists of a series of step dances with claps of hands.

The feast and dance are the necessary final touches for a happy marriage.

Their Religion.

The Chenchus worship a God called *Chenchu-dêvata* to whom honey and fruits are given on all festive occasions and whenever the people of a *gûdem* suffer from a fell disease or famine. The Chenchus also worship God Narasimha Swami of Ahobilam whom they call *obelesu.* They believe till this day that this God is the incarnation of Sri Krishna who is said to have married a Chenchu girl called "Chen chîta", and who gave to the Chenchus as dowry or girl-price *'veduru-pidiyam'* or bamboo-forest, For this reason, the Chenchus claim to live by 'veduru-jîvanam, i. e., they depend upon the bamboo for their livelihood, and claim an exclusive right to cut and sell the same. At present, this is the main occupation of the Chenchus of Rampa and Polavaram Agencies. One can see even now dozens of these Chenchu families floating the bamboo down the Godavari, and finally settling on its banks at Rajahmundry, and disposing of it either wholesale or in retail, to the local merchants. The Chenchus also worship Râma and Lakshmaṇa whom they adore on all festive occasions. From this account, it is clear that the Chenchus follow the Vishnu cult. As further proof of this, we get the Chenchus putting their caste mark in a vertical line or lines like the Vaishnavites. The Chenchus, in addition, also worship several forest gods and goddesses like Pôtaraju, Gurappa, Sunkâlamma etc.

Castes among Chenchus.

The Chenchus believe that Krishna himself divided their whole *Chenchu-kulam* into seven classes. These are the wild Chenchus; the *Gaita* Chenchus or casteless Chenchus who are now called *Gadapalu* who follow cultivation as their main profession; the *Dâsari* Chenchus who live by selling wigs made of the hair of peacocks, deer and other forest animals; the Puṭṭa Chenchus who live by selling honey, wax and other forest produce; the *Ata* Chenchus who live by performing street plays, which are in the nature of pantomimes; the *Veta* Chenchus who live by hunting and fishing; and lastly the *Muturasus* who live by selling seeds, beads etc. There is neither inter-marriage nor inter-dining among these seven classes of Chenchus. A rigid system of caste has sprung up and this may be due to the different professions followed by the several classes of Chenchus.

Birth Customs.

The Chenchu birth customs are closely akin to those of the other forest tribes like the Kôyas[1]. The newly born baby is washed

1. See ante page 33 ff.

on alternate days and on the eleventh day the whole clan will assemble to witness the naming ceremony. The child receives the name of an ancestor or a forest God. A feast and dance are the natural accompaniments of such occassions. A few Chenchu names are *Atchigadu, Bodigadu, Vanamulgadu, Nagalutigadu, Pôlugadu* etc.

Death Customs:—

The Chenchus believe that all diseases are due to evil spirits. Hence they take special care to propitiate them. Any death that is caused is atributed to the wrath of some God or Devil. The dead are not burnt but are buried. The Chenchus observe pollution for eleven days just like the Hindus and on the eleventh day, they pour some milk and rice on the burial mound. The Chenchus celebrate *Pedda-dinam* by giving a feast to all the assembled relatives.

Language:—

The Chenchus of Vizagapatam and Godavari Agencies speak both Oriya and Telugu languages. But very few of them know how to write. The Chenchus who live in Nallamalai hills speak only Telugu. In recent years the Government opened Elementary schools for the spread of education among these Chenchus. As a result of such efforts, a few Chenchu boys are now able to read and write. But their knowledge is elementary. The forest and the agriculturual departments are also trying to teach them how to cultivate land so that by leading a settled life, the Chenchus may become more peaceful.

Conclusion:—

The Chenchus enjoy a popularity which is unknown to the other jungle tribes and this is due to several reasons. Firstly, the Chenchus who live in the Coastal districts follow a peaceful profession. Secondly, they are not notorious like the Yânâdis for any thieving or other wicked propensities. The wild Chenchus of Kurnool are, of course, an exception. Thirdly, the Chenchus are familiar to the people for the reason that they claim a notable connection with Sree Krishna In memory of this event, till this day, what are called *Chenchu-natakams* are enacted in all parts of Andhra desa. Such street dramas which are enacted to engage the minds of the masses, remind us through Krishna's alleged marrying the *Chenchita* or *Chenchu Lakshmi* of the hoary antiquity and fortunate position of these Chenchus.

(To be continued)

TAPASAVATSARAJA.

By M. Ramakrishnakavi, M. A.

It was about four decades ago that Dr. E. Hultzsch had the fortune to discover the presence of this rare drama in Sanskrit somewhere in the Punjab, and the manuscript was according to the article of late Bhaṭṭanâthaswâmin in the Indian antiquary was offered to the Bodleian Library but was refused as the work was apparently wanting in beginning and end. Two photograph copies of the work are preserved in the University Library of Bonn and in the Imperial Library of Prussia. We do not know the fate of the original. In my tour in Malabar and South India for manuscripts I had the fortune to meet an old lady in Malabar, who studied this work in her youth and was able to repeat many of its best verses. Though this made me conduct a more vigourous search for a copy of it in that country, I could not find any trace of the work. Study of great rhetorical works as *Sringaraprakasa* of Bhôja, *Vakròktijîvita* of Kuntalaka, *Kâvyânusasana* of Hêmachandra, *Dhvanyaloka* with Lôcana and a train of commentaries on the latter, and the commentary on the *Nâtyasâstra* by Abhinavagupta where this work has been given high place in the dramatic literature, prompted me to secure a copy of this drama at any cost. At the kind suggestion of Dr. S. K. De, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Dacca, I applied to Dr. John Noble of Berlin to favour me with a copy of it. The learned Doctor, to whom we should be very grateful, has been kind to send me photographs for the whole work. Had it not been for his noble compliance I and my friends would not have studied a dramatic piece wherein every word and sentence reveal true poetry according to the opinion of Kuntalaka.

The work extends over 32 plates in photograph each representing two pages in the original reduced by half its size. It is in old Kashmirian script and a man of South India cannot easily read it unless he possesses some epigraphical experience. The work wants about ten lines in the beginning and half a sloka in the final *Bharatavâkya* or benedictory verse. Two pages in the middle of the fifth act appear to have been stuck together and their separation was probably found to be dangerous to the adjoining two other pages and hence that portion forms a lacuna. If the original is available for examination some scientific means may be devised to read out the two pages now missing in the photo-copy. Otherwise the work may be said to be complete and the manuscript is remarkably faultless. Its recension closely agrees with the quotations given by Abhinavagupta, Kuntalaka, Hêmachandra and Râmachandra, but slightly differs from those

quoted by Bhôja in his *Srngaraprakasa,* where, to adduce an instance, the exit of Padmâvati at the end of the third act from the stage occurs earliar in our manuscript than in the qoutation of Bhoja. Many of the Prakrit passages have been rendered in Sanskrit, sometimes even in the middle of a prakrit speech. This was due to the lazy scribe who copied only the Sanskrit equivilent noted above each Prakrit word in his original. For he has copied both the forms in several cases and the rules of the dramaturgy strictly require Prakrit there. The quotations of Bhoja contain pure prakrit form in such places.

It is matter for curiosity to find that this drama was not quoted by any of the known writers after 1200 A. D. It was well studied in Northern India and Kashmir for four centuries beginning from 800 A. D. The earliest writers who mentioned the drama, were two contemporaries in the court of Jayâpîḍı of Kashmir, *viz.,* Dâmôdaragupta in his *Kuttanimata* and Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyaloka.* Though the work was apparently neglected by scholars after the 12th century, it is to the credit of the European research that the fine production has been at last recovered.

The author of the drama is *Matraraja* otherwise known as Anangaharsha, son of Narendravardhana. He wrote his work to his learned audience, who obtained scholarship in Vyâkaraṇa Mîmânsa, Nyâya, languages and kindred arts. He himself studied other's works without envy and was always ready to sacrifice even his life to his friends if necessary. Who is this Matraraja? It is irony of fate regarding every great poet that a mystery enshrouds his history and when any meagre information is available it is generally open to a number of interpretations. We are tempted to advance a dogma that the more unknown a poet is the greater lives he in the man's memory. In the history of the Sanskrit literature in none of the known works Mâtrarâja occurs as an author of a drama. The author of *Kuttinimata* mentions his another name, Anangaharsh [1] as a patron of actors and actresses who after he reached Heaven had to seek the patronage of temples to display their histrionic talents during divine processions. But the work is quoted by name by Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Kuntalaka, Hema and others.

1 पुनरारब्धविश्रान्ते रसस्याङ्गिनोऽ नुसन्धिश्च यथा तापसवत्सराजे (ध्वन्या --

2 शृङ्गारानन्तरं नियमेन करुणे व्याप्रियते। तज्जन्मनि यथा तापसवत्सराजे
(अभिनवभारती)

1 वयमापि देवनिकेतनमनङ्गहर्षे गते त्रिदिवलोकम्
आश्रितवन्ते गत्या तीर्थस्थानानुरोधेन॥

3 यथातापसवत्सराजे विलास सर्वस्व निधान भूतत्वोदाहरणं करुणः प्रत्यङ्गमभि नवभङ्गीभि रुद्भासते (वक्रोक्तिजीवितम्)

4 यथा तापसवत्सरजे षष्ठेऽङ्के.... (नाट्यदर्पणः

There is a poet called Māyurāja familiar to writers on *Alañkara* and anthologies who is according to Dhanika the author of *Udâttaraghava.* यथ छम्दना वालिवधो मायुराजेनोदत्तराघवे परित्यक्तः *(Dasarûpaka III 24.)* The word Māyurāja does not readily suggest us any etymological sense and one is even tempted to doubt whether it is a Prakrit word. This belief is strengthened when we meet with the form माउराज the *second* letter being a vowel. Vide *Udayasundari,* page 150 line 21,

सामन्तैश्च वाक्पतिराजमाउराजविशारवदेवप्रभृतिभिः समन्तादलंकृतं कवीनांबृन्दं....

Can माउ which becomes मायु in later Prākrit by vowel changing into a semi-vowel to be a Prākrit form of *matra* itself? In that case Mātrarāja can be read as Māyurāja. To support this derivation the word *mavati* in southern vernaculars is derived from *matra* both meaning controller of an elephant. The term *mahamatra* is commented upon in this sense in the commentary on Vâtsyāyana's *Kamasùtras*:— महामात्रेति। महमात्रा येषामिति महासामन्ता वा हस्तिशिक्षायां वा तल्लक्षणमनुसर्तव्यम् There is an alternative suggestion not more plausible for the identity of the two words. In old Kashmirian script *ta tra* and *u* resemble each other so closely that one may be easily read for another. Eveu in the photo-copy of the present transcript there is not much difference between *ta* and *u.* and *tra* is known only by an addition of a stroke underneath which in an injured manuscript may be read with the next line. The scribe might easily prefer *mâtrarâja* for *mâyurâja* or *mâ-u-raja* as the last two forms do not readily give him any sense. Even the editors of *Udayasundari* had this difficulty and put a question mark beside the word माउराज to doubt its correct form. But between these two suggestions Mâyurâja may be taken as a derivative of Mâtrarâja. The author belongs to the family of *sâmantas* or *mahamatras* according to the quotation cited above.

Why should there be all this trouble of identifying Mâtrarâja with Mâyuraja? Sarvânanda in his commentary on *Nâmaliñganusasana* explaining the word *kanduti* (कण्डूति) quotes a line from our drama as Mâyurajâs. (Dr, Ganapati Sâstri read the letter wrongly as *madhuraja*; for *yu* and *thu* resemble very much in the Grandha script) But our manuscript has clearly Māyurāja. Verses from

Udattaraghava quoted by Bhôja and Râmachandra in his *Natyadarpana* bear strong resemblance in diction to the verses in *Tapasavatsaraja.* Bhôja quotes a verse probably from *Udattaraghava* whose latter half coincides with the latter portion of a verse at the end of the first act in our drama. This shows that even if *Udattaraghava* is not his work there must be another yet not available to us.

सन्ध्याक्रान्तिकषायितेन नभसा प्रत्यच्चसन्नं शनै—
लींलावेश्मनि दीपरश्मिजटिलं नीलं तमो जृम्भते।
वेल्लद्बाहु लताविलोलवलयस्वानैरितः सूचित—
व्यापाराः प्रनियोजयान्ति विविधा वाराङ्गना वर्णकान्॥ (Uduttarâghava)

प्रारब्धो मणिदीपयष्टिषु समं पातः पतङ्गैरितो
गन्धान्धैराभितोमधुव्रतकुलैरुत्पद्ममभिः स्थीयते।
वेल्लद्बाहुलताविलोलवलयस्वानैरितः सूचित—
व्यापाराः प्रतियोजयान्ति विविधावाराङ्गना वर्णकान्॥ (Tapasavatsaraja)

Under these circumstances on the strength of Sarvânanda alone *Tapasavatsaraja* may be ascribed to Mâyurâj, the author of *Udattaraghava.*

Then follows the question, may we know anything about Mayuraja? Râjasêkhra calls him a *Kalachûri* prince and Sodhala, the author of *Udayasundari,* calls him a *Samanta* king and ranks him with Viśâkhadeva and Vakpatirâja.

मायुराजसमो जाते नान्यः कलचुरिः कविः।
उदन्वतः समुत्तस्थुः कति वा तुहिनांशवः॥ (Rajasekhara)

"सामन्तैश्च वावतिजमाउराजविशारवदेवप्रभृतिभिः (Udayasundarikatha page 150)

From this it may be understood that he was a Kalachuri king ruling probably at Mâhishmati an older capital. Murâri when he describes Mâhishmati has a fling at it in which he uses the *ananga.* Murari belongs to 1100 A. D. and probably he would not have meant the author of *Tapasavatsaraja.* a pious king to be the subject of his description. No inscription so far as I know is forthcoming to fix the date of Mâyurâja or Anangaharsha even if they are two different poets. Syâmilaka in his *Padataditaka* locates his hero in "Sârvabhauma-narêndra-nagarî" in Saurashṭradeśa. Whether Narendravardhana, the father of our author had anything to do with that city is still doubtful.

When did Mâtraraja or Mâyuraja flourish? He is of course older than 800 A. D. The author of *Kuttinimata* throws a hint that Anangaharsha having gone to Heaven that the actress had to take up

Ratnavali lest she would forget her histrionic profession, Does this seriously suggest that Mâtrarâja lived earlier than Srî Harsha? Unhappily we differ with the generality of the present day scholars in attributing the three dramas, *Ratnavali* etc., to Harshavardhana and I have joined the minority who consider that the dramas were written by Srî Harshadeva, the King of Ujjain two centuries earlier than Harshavardhana. Sri Harsha was also the commentator on the *Natyasastra* of Bharata, which is called *Vartika* and he is certainly older than Rahulaka, who is known as *Vartikakara* on the same, who is assigned to 400 A. D.

To strengthen the suggestion that *Tapasavatsaraja* might be an older work than *Ratnavali* arguments are not wanting. Before Sri Harsha, the themes of the marriages of Vâsavadatta and Padmâvati were exhausted by Subandhu, Sûdraka, Bhâsa, and probably Mâyurâja and hence Ratnâvali. who takes the place of Padmâvati in the original story of Udayana has been newly invented while the marriage of Padmâvati, the central theme of this work exists even in Bṛhatkatha. If the Kashmerian version is thought as an improvement upon later dramas in Sanskrit, the Nepalese version also contains it.

महावरोधनस्यापि भार्याबिद्धिर्व्दये स्थिता (?)
तस्यवासवदत्तायां पद्मावत्यां च भूपते:॥

Udayana is the hero of a cycle of dramas and *kavyas* in early centuries of the Christian era both before and after, for Subandhu a contemporary of Bindusâra, introduced in his Vâsavadatta a series of inter-dramas, one in another. Bhâsa used the same theme in his *Svapnavasavadatta* If the printed edition does not represent the real work of Bhâsa in entirety the story is the same and the author of *Natyadarapana* quotes from it as भासकृते स्वप्नवासवदत्ते and Bhoja gives the explanation of the word Svapnavâsavadatta as

स्वप्नवासवदत्ते पद्मावतीमस्वस्थांद्रष्टुं राजा समुद्रगृहकं गत....वासवदत्तां च स्वप्नवदस्वप्ने ददर्श। स्वप्नायमानश्च वासवदत्तामाबभाषे....

There is a drama called *Manoramavatsaraja* written by Bhîmaṭa who according to Râjasêkhara was the author of five dramas in which *Svapanadasanana* is mentioned by Bhôja. We know that Manôrama was the handmaid of Priyadarśika who was set to put on the character of Udayana in the inter drama in it. Viśâkhadêva, now assigned to the court of Chandragupta II, wrote three dramas (*Mudrarakshasa*, *Devîchandragupta* and *Abhisarikavanchitaka*) and in the last of these Padmâvatî is characterised as murderess of Udayana's son. This terrible characterisation of Padmâvati was probably borrowed from the Buddhist *Jataka* stories where Mâkandika or Anupama, an envious creature dupes Udayana.

There is also a drama called *Padmavatîparinaya* in which, however, the hero is a brahman and hence it has no connection with our Padmâvatî.

Of these dramas where Padmâvati comes in Subandhu's and Bhâsa's are older and Bhîmâṭa's *Manòramavatsaraja* is later than *Tapasavatsaraja* for in it Rumaṇvan's character is a latter development upon that in the *Tapasavatsaraja*. The Pânchâla occupation of Kauśâmbî is common to both, but in Bhîmaṭa's work Rumaṇvan is made to be a traitor who took the side of Panchâla and sets fire to Lâvaṇaka, the autumnal residence of Udayana, which in *Tapasavtsaraja* is set fire to by Yaugandharâyaṇa himself as in the original story of *Brhatkatha*. Rumaṇvan says:-

कौशाम्बी मम हस्त एव परयाशक्त्या मया स्वीकृत:
पञ्चालाधिपति: प्रभु: समनतां न त्तायते क्वाधुना।
नन्वादीपित एष मोहितपरानीकेन लावाणक:
देवी संप्रति रद्ध्यतामयमहं प्राप्तो रुमरावान्स्वयम्॥

The question of priority of Viśâkhadeva to Anangaharsha is still therefore at issue.

Regarding the date of mâtrarâja another piece of evidence probably of internal and supporting nature, may be adduced to place him about 600 A. D. The rules of Bharata in using various metres suitable to the prevailing *rasa* and *bhava* and to the five forms of *Dhruvas*, *Pravesíkí*, *naishkramikî etc.*, are entirely ignored after Kâlidâsa. In Sûdraka, Kâlidasa, and in some of the dramas attributed to Bhâsa, Bharata's dictum is carried to perfection. But in the later dramas the selection of the metre depended upon the poet'' mastery of language irrespective of the propriety of the scene. The depiction of pathos to a high degree in this drama induces us to place its author contemporaneous with Bhavabhûti, "the master of pathoss' or even half a century earlier if diction and other dramatic devices in the plot can ever determine the age of the poet.

Another ground though not very sure to place the author in the sixth or early seventh century is the device in the plot that the hero becomes a Buddhist *tapasa*. Buddhist monks were of two types-one of permanent set who could not once more enter into his family and the other of a temporary type where after the purpose was over he becomes a grihasta once more. Udayana and his clown became monks of the latter class. Bhagavadajjuka, a drama by Mahendravikrama, of 7th Century also has an example of this type in the pupil there.

Our poet has developed such perfect individuality in both styles and thought as any good critic can easily identify his verses quoted in any anthology or in a work on poetics. Verses quoted from a drama

called *Visranta-Sûdraka* leave the stamp of his genius and there also Haragaṇa to show his loyalty to his lord Súdraka burns his wife Harimati and finds when he failed in his object to save his master, that he burnt his spouse needlessly. Then he repents for his masterly folly and gruesome sin and throws himself into fire like Udıyana in our drama. But his master being watchful of him like Yaugandharâyaṇa in our drama saves him and hands over Harimatî whom he alreaby saved. It is already said that the verses from *Udâttarâghava* reveal the same tendency.

The general theme in this drama can easily be guessed if we know to what class of dramas it belongs. In Sanskrit, dramas are either of entirely amorous sentiments or based upon any political plots or combination of both. *Mudrarâkshasa* is purely political, while *Sâkuntala, Vikramorvasi, Malatimadhava, etc.*, belong to purely amorous class. This drama though apparently amorous in its theme and the hero being a king, is subject to cruel separation from his wife, the central plot thrown to backgroud reveals the preponderence of political strategem. Most of the dramas in Sanskrit relate the adventures of minister to glorify his sovereign's power or to reconquer the lost territories from the hands of an enemy while the monarch almost blind to his political conditions which he generally leaves in the hands of his ministers, is otherwise engaged in winning the favour of a maid thrown across him by mere accident. Thus both political and amorous adventures respectively of the minister and the sovereign are combined to make up a theme and poetic devices are introduced from the canons of Kauṭilya and Vâtsyâyana for the respective departments. In amorous themes *Vipralrmbha* or separation before marriage is generally adopted. Poets like Bhavabhuti, Bâṇa and our Anangaharsha possess a rare genius for the elaboration of *Vipralambha-karuna* bordering on *Karuna* itself. This has immortalised their fame. As Bhôja and Abhinavagupta would have it the *mana-sringara* is most powerful in intensifying the amourous pleasure but *karuna-vĭpralambha* has a masterly effect on the minds of the audience. The hero who kneels before his angry lover is more pitied for his tactless folly with few cheers, and the moment, after it passes off as a piece of social humour. But *karunavipralambha* appeals to the heart of the audience, and makes them feel the cruel power of omnipotence and to condone with the hero. The impression is lasting in our minds. In this drama the theme is so finely developed as to increase pathos steadily till it ends almost in ecstasy.

Tapasavatsaraja belongs to that class of dramas whose theme is a combination of politics and amours. And the latter is of *karuna-vipralambha* type, powerful enough to melt down the heart of a sage.

Ratnavali, Priyadarsika, Malavika, Kaumudimahôtsava, Svapnavasavadatta, Pratigna-yaugandharagana and *Dêvichandragupta, Vikrantasudraka* are all similar in maitaining a politico-amorous theme, where one or the other is predominant. In *Ratnavali, Malavika* and *Priyadarsika* love adventure is brought to relief, but in Sudraka's *Vatsaraja-charita, Pratignayaugandharayana, Devibhandragupta,* love episede is enveloped by deep political necessities.

In *Kaumudimahestara* the hero whose father lost his kingdom and life in a battle, was driven to run for his life and grow up in a disguise. Mantragupta, the minister of his father, by a series of strategems recovers the lost kingdom from the hands of the Liechavis his conquerors. Hero's advance of love to Kirtimati. the daughter of the king of Saurashtra excite no interest or sympathy.

In *Devichandrgaupta* the heroine Dhruvadevi when she was in her husband's camp with a small retinue who enjoyed their summer in the cool abodes of the Himalayan frontier, was carried away by an unprincipled foreigner a Saka by birth and was much tormented to accept his hand. A brother of Chandragupta II who was her husband in the disguise of a courtesan formed a dramatic company and approached the licentious Saka. By a series of political strategems Kumarachandragupta makes Dhruvadevi escape and take her place in a female garb. When the Saka prince almost became mad of his love to Dhruvadevi and self-sufficiency blinded him to the probable dangers from an offended enemy, he allowed himself to meet in a secret chamber the enemy in the disguise of his favourite object which he sought for. He had his emoluments for his accumulated follies. He is no more pitied than Kîchaka repaid by Bhîma. In this the amorous adventure is entirely subsidiary.

In *Tapasavatsaraja,* Udayana's extreme attentions to his amiable Vâsavadattâ made him purely confined to the harem where he was engrossed in all incidental pleasures. Khe King of Pânchâla invaded his country and when he encamped with his wife and retinue in a distant autumnal abode, his capital fell into the hands of the enemy. Two chief ministers saw the folly and believed that the king would not heed to anything in the world as long as Vāsavadattā was with him. Vāsavadattā, though young, was noble and quite capable of realising and maintaining her position. She was the daughter of Pradyôta of Ujjain, famous for his heroism and able administration. Wise ministers also surrounded him. Vâsavadattā had her lessons of politics from her father and his ministers. Yaugandharāyaṇa and Rumanvan confer together on their helpless condition and all their attempts to recover their kingdom from the hands of the Pānchala did not promise any success owing to Udayana's reckless neglect of his political affairs. Yaugandharāyaṇa desired to present a united front

to the conqueror to which Pradyôta and his sons joined. Yet their combined effort was too feeble and the assistance of one more sovereign was absolutely necessary. Darśaka, the King of Magadha had a sister of maraiageable age. No match suitable to her still came forward. He was a powerful King whose assistance would be substantially adding strength to Udayana. Yaugandharāyaṇa made bold to obtain the hand of the sister of Darsaka for his master to gain him to his side, for the latter also would be so glad as not to miss the offer. But Vāsavadattā stood in the way. Neither she nor Udayana would accept another being, though she might be as bright as a nymph to share their pleasures. Mahāsena (Pradyota) who saw the situation yielded to admit a rival to his daughter; for to him, love finds no place when glory is at stake. He addressed an epistle to his daughter which made her realise her situation. Yaugandharāyaṇa'to whom she showed a godly reverence prevailed upon her and a plot was devised for her separation from the husband. Their autumnal residence was set fire to during the King's absence on a hunting expedition. He returned half way to see everything reduced to ashes. He is informed that Vāsavadatta along with Yaugandharāyaṇa was burnt. He becomes almost mad and runs after her to perish in the very flames. He accuses the God of Fire of his dire ingratitude for it was his great ancestor, Arjuna, who cured him of his mortal ailments by using the herbs of the Khâṇḍava forest. He loathes to approach the ungrateful fire. On the advice of Rumaṇvan he becomes a Buddhist *tapasa* and goes to various holy places. Meanwhile Darśaka learns the fate of Vāsavadattā which removed the only barrier to his offering of his sister, Padmāvati, to Udayana. Yaugandharāyaṇa sends Udayana's picture through a nun to Padmāvati. Her love deepens into such reverence that she worships him every day herself becoming a nun. Yaugandharâyaṇa brings Vāsavadattā to the hermitage of a nun where Padmāvatî stayed and requested the latter to give shelter to his sister till he brings back her husband who abandoned her. Padmâvatî was much pleased with the amiable nature of Vasavadattā and treated her very soon as her bosom friend. She reveals her heart to Vāsavadattā who after all admires the young maiden for her nobility of mind. Udayana and his clown bôth being monks visit several sacred places and reach the banks of Yamunā where the hermitage of the nun was situated. He hears of Padmāvatî's devotion and as if by accident sees her. Padmāvatî recieves the Royal guest as becoming of a nun and princess. During his wanderings a *siddha* prophesied that he would recover his Vāsavadattā when he marries a royal maiden. What a curious ordinance of God is that? Can a dead person whose body was burnt to ashes present himself once more in the same old mortal body? If he marries a girl once more what would Vāsavadatta think of him who said to her that he would not live a moment without her? But

he should get her back at any cost. The hand of Padmâvati was accepted but he was mad after a dead woman; and madness too was incurable. He was of course very kind to her but she was miserable and intent upon suicide. Udayana and his clown were on the spot and saved her. This tormented the poor king more of his unfaithfulness to a devoted princess. Meanwhile his ministers formed an alliance with Darśaka and Mahāsêna and their combined armies encountered Pānchāla who was in possession of Kauśāmbî and took him a captive.

But Udayana had still no news of these proceedings. He was mad after Vāsavadattā. He married even Padmāvatî, yet the prophecy was not fulfilled. The *siddha* might be wrong and for him it was ingratitude to survive her. He must commit himself to flames. The confluence of the Jamna and the Ganges is the sacred spot where the death of a person brings him in the next birth to the realisation of his intense desires. Udayana resolves to die there. He asks his servants to kindle fire while he bathes in the holy flood. Meanwhile Vāsavadattā impatient of weary paths of Yaugandharāyaṇa in spite of his admonition goes to the same spot to commit the same forlorn crime. The mad man is seen with disshevelled hair sprinkling water. Padmāvatî follows him like a shade. Yaugandharâyaṇa sees him at a distance and repents for his folly or policy which torments the king so cruelly. It was a dark night. The King goes round the fire when his jester companion draws his attention to some woman falling into the fire. His chivalry quickened and he ran to save her who was none but Vāsavadatta. Yaugandharāyaṇa presented himself to the King when Rumaṇvan brought the tidings of their conquest of Pânchāla. All meet together and every thing ends well.

The plot is similar to that in *Svapnavâsavadatta* but in depth of pathos Māyurāja excells Bhāsa. In their attempts Rumaṇvan and Yaugandharāyaṇa faltered twice at the pitiable condition of the king and were about to put an end to the torments of the King. But a moment's thought taught them to pursue their grave and piteous course. In this plot Udayana and Padmāvatî alone were kept away from the truth and they were mere puppets in the secret guidance of the King's wise ministers who like Fates in the Grecian Mythology did whatever they pleased. All the other characters knowing the truth pretend to sympathise the King—a position really difficult to maintain on a stage. Our sympathies are with Vāsavadattā, for her magnanimity rises to the occasion even at great mental torture. She trusted in the wisest counsel of the great minister but as a woman was afraid of the mental tension of her husband.

Unlike in Bhāsa's drama every character here exhibits some deep individual trait though under the guidance of a superior will.

The plot extends over six acts and pathos has an even developement throughout. The language is polished unlike in *Vatsarâjacharita* of Sûdraka and fine strokes of original thought sufficiently compensate his ruggedness of style.

To illustrate his poetic genius a few verses are given below from the drama:-

फुल्लेन्दीवरकाननानि नयने पाणी सरोजाकरा
स्तन्वीयं जघनस्थलोरुपुलिना रोमावलीनिम्नगाः ।
प्रत्यङ्गेषु नवेव संप्रति शरल्लक्ष्मीरियं दृश्यते
तच्चिह्नैरधुनाप्रसाधनविधौ बद्धो वृथैवादरः ॥

उत्सर्पद्धमलेखवातिविषि तमसि मनाग्विस्फुलिङ्गायमानै—
रुद्भेदैस्तारकाणां वियति परिगते पश्चिमाशामुपेतैः ।
स्वेदेनेवानतासु स्खलदलिरशना स्वब्जिनीप्रेयसीषु
प्रायः सन्ध्यातपाग्नौ विशति दिनपतौ दह्यते वासरश्रीः ।

संक्रान्ताङ्गुलिपर्वसूचितकरस्वापाकपोलस्थली
नेत्रे निर्जनमुक्तबाष्पकलुषे निश्वास तान्तो ऽधरः।
बन्धस्रस्तविसंस्थुलालकलता निर्वेदशून्यं मनः
कष्टं दुर्णयवेदिभिः कुसचिवैर्वत्सा दृढं खेद्यते ॥

किञ्चित्कुञ्चितचञ्चुचुम्बनसुखी स्फारीभवल्लोचना
स्वप्नामोचितचारुचाटुकरणैश्चीतोऽ र्पयन्ती मुहुः ।
कूजन्ती विततैकपक्षतिपुटेनालिङ्ग्यलीलालसं
धन्यं कान्तमुपान्तवर्तिनमियं पारावतं (चुम्बते)॥

संक्रुद्धस्य ललाटलोचनभुवा सप्तार्चिषा धूर्जटे—
र्निर्दग्धे मकरध्वजे रतिरसौ किं स्याद्गृहीतव्रता ।
संवासाद्वनदेवतामुनिवधूवेषप्रपञ्चे गतः
कुत्वेत्थं रमतेऽ लविग्रहवती किंवापतःश्री रियम् ॥

आदौमानपरिग्रहेण गुरुणा दूरं समारोपितां
पश्चात्तापभरेण तानवकृता नीतां परा लाघवम् ।
उत्सङ्गान्तरवर्तिनीमनुगमास्तंपिण्डिसाङ्गीमिमां
सर्वाङ्गप्रणयां प्रियामिव तरुश्छायां समालम्बते ॥
देवीस्वीकृतमानसस्य निभृतं स्वप्नायमानस्यमे
तद्गोत्रग्रहणादियं सुवदना यायात्कथं न व्यथाम् ।
इत्थं यन्त्रणया कथं कथमपि क्षीणा निशा जाग्रतो
दाक्षिण्योपहतेन सा प्रियतमा स्वप्नेऽपि नासादिता ॥
दिशि प्राच्यां भूत्वा प्रथममयमात्मार्पणपरो
विनातस्यास्तापं परुषतरमासाद्य सुचिरम् ।
प्रतीचीमारक्ता द्रुतमनुसरन्संप्रति सखे
विवस्वान्मे सर्वं वद यदि विडम्बं नकुरुते ॥
वहसि सहसा दृष्ट्वा दृष्टिं वृताश्रुलवाकुलां
विधूतविषमोद्भिन्नैः श्वासैर्विकम्पिपयोधरा
वदसि न चिरं ध्यानक्षामा मयि स्थिरकौतुके
पुनरपि गता किं त्वं मुदेव वधूव्रतम् ॥
धूमौघान्निर्गताभिः कबलितककुभः कालवक्त्रातिभाभि
र्ज्वालाजिह्वालताभिर्दिवमखिलजगद्ग्रासलोलं लिहानः ।
हाहाकारैर्जनानामनुसृतविषमोद्गारगम्भीरनादः
कल्पान्तभ्रान्तचामीकरशिखरनि भो यातिनिस्तारमग्निः ॥

NOTES.

We regret that, owing to the changes in the editorial staff during the quarter the issue of this part of the journal has been unduly delayed.

By the death of Dr. E. Hultzsch passes away one of the most prominent figures in the field of South Indian Epigraphy. He rendered strenuous continuous service for over forty years in the department of Archaeology, Madras and is mainly responsible for the discovery and publication of the most important inscriptions published by it. Besides being a mere epigraphist he is an oriental scholar of vast learning and insight and he continued his study and investigation even after his retirement. The results of his work in the various fields is too well known to need repetition and we place on record our sincere sorrow for his death and our heartfelt gratitude for his services.

We are glad to note that Mr. Hirananda Sastry and his assistant of the Archaeological department have unearthed a number of Brahmi inscriptions resembling those of Amaravathi at Nagarjunakonda and Ramireddipalem in the Guntur District Madras Presidency. It is said that tbey throw light on the Ikshvaku dynasty of which very little is known till now. It is well known that the second and third centuries of the Christian era are the darkest period in History especially Indian, and we welcome any light about the obscure period. We eagerly await the publication of the inscriptions found.

Mr. Bhavaraju. V. Krishnarao a member of our society points out the existence of the remains of a Chaitya and a Vihara in Yerrampalem a village twenty miles north of Rajahmundry and two miles from the trunk road. The remains are on a bill not far from the village and consist of five stupas in more or less ruined condition and four caves near them two of them covering Dagobas and one of them unfinished. From the name Pandavula Metta given to it by the villagers and from general appearance they appear to be very old Buddhist Stupas. Finds of old coins also are reported from time to time. The villagers report the existence of bigger caves in the neighbourhood. It is expected that a regular excavation may bring to light important material for the construction of a connected history and the attention of the archaeological department is drawn to it.

REVIEWS.

Administration report of the Madras Government Museum And Connemara Library for 1925-1926.

F. H. GRAVELY, D. Sc.

The report tells us that the scientific staff of the Museum devoted much time to investigation and collected large and useful finds. Mr. R. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar M. A., who is a specialist in numismatics has, we are glad to note, begun to catalogue the coins in which some gold coins of the sub-ordinates of the Kakatiyas have been discovered.

During the year, three copper images and one stone image have been acquired. Two inscriptions from Dharanikota have been obtained. Also two sets of copperplate records of the Salankayana kings, Vijayaskanda-Varma and Nandivarma respectively and two sets of copperplate records, bearing along with the usual Chalukyan emblems, the legend "Sree Tribhuvanamkusa" of the Eastern Chalukyan king Sarvalokasraya Sree Vishnuvardhana Maharaja Vijayaditya VII have been purchased. In the two latter grants, the Eastern Chalukyan king gives away the villages of Mavenderu and Krumduru, free from all taxes, to two different Vedic Scholars who however belong to the same gotra-Parasara for the merit, prosperity and the health of the king. The Genealogy of the Eastern Chalukyan kings down to the donor is given in both the grants. Vijayaditya is said to have succeeded to the Eastern Chalukyan throne on the death of his elder step-brother, Rajaraja Narendra. These grants are important inasmuch as it is said therein that Vijayaditya allowed his son Saktivarma to rule, but that after the premature death of that son after one year's rule, he again took the reins of government into his own hands out of regard for Dharma. Both the grants were made in the twelfth regnal year of Vijayaditya which corresponds to 1075. A. D. The language of both the inscriptions is Sanskrit and the alphabet used is old Telugu. One more copperplate of the Eastern Chalukya king Vishnu vardhana Maharaja III dated about 710 A. D. was also purchased. Besides in the form of donations, several useful finds and coins were collected.

It is a very useful and interesting report and our thanks are due to the superintendent for favouring us with a copy of the report and a catalogue of the copperplate grants of the museum and a book of coins of Hyder Ali and Tippu.

R. S. R.

1

HYDERABAD ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERIES Nos. 1–7

Published by H. E. H. the Nizams government under the direction of G. YAZDANI, Esq, M. A., *Supt. of Archaeology, Hyderabad.*

No. 1. New Asokan Edict of Maski

Edited by RAO SAHEB H. KRISHNA SASTRI.

Maski is a village in Raichur District. In this village in 1915 Mr. C. Beadon discovered some old writing on a big boulder of stone at the mouth of a cavern on the slope of a hill and made an eye copy of the same and sent them to Mr. Sastri who went at once to the place to examine it *in situ* and to interpret the writings.

It is an important inscription as it mentions the name of Asoka as its author. The contents are the same as those of Rupnath and the other early edicts and hence it is one of the earliest edicts of Asoka and belongs to the thirteenth year after the coronation. It tells us that Asoka was a lay disciple at first for two years and a half and then joined the Buddhist Sangha. Having found the old gods of Jambudvipa untrue, he laid down that both the small and great men could achieve the result by applying themselves to Dharma.

No. 2. Daulatabad plates of Jagadekamalla 1017. A. D.

Edited by D. R. BHANDARKAR, M. A.,
AND
K. N. DIKSHIT, M. A.,

It is a set of three plates with a seal which contains the Varaha Lanchana and other Chalukyan royal emblems. The language is Sanskrit and the script is old Nagari and a little of Canarese. The record gives the origin and growth of the Chalukyan power and the Geneology of the dynasty down to the donor Jayasimha II (Jagadekamalla) who by this grant gives to a brahmin, a great Vedic scholar, on the occasion of an eclipse the village of Nakavegumalu in 1017. A. D.

No. 3. Palampet and Uparpalli temple inscriptions

Edited by Dr. L. BARNETT, M. A., Litt. D.,

The language of the Palampet inscriptions is sanskrit and the script is Telugu. The subject matter of the record is the pious deeds of Rêcherla Rudra, a general in the service of King Ganapati of

the Kakatiya Dynasty. His lineage (Brahma, Kataya I, Kama, Kataya II, and Rudra) is given and his exploits are described. He performed the consecration ceremony of God Rudreswara in Orugallu and endowed it with the village Nekkonda. He built a new city in which he constructed a temple to Rudreswara and endowed it with the villages of Uparpalli and Borlapadu. He also endowed other temples with rich gifts. The date of the grant is I213. A. D.

Both the language and the script of Uparpalli inscription are Telugu. The date of the inscription is given as 1236 A. D. The origin of Recherla Rudra is given. The grant is made by Kataya in the reign of the Kakatiya king, Ganapati Deva, of several estates to the God of the temple.

No. 4. The Pakhal pillar inscription of the reign of Kakatiya Ganapati Deva

Edited by Dr. L. D. BARNET M. A.,

The language is sanskrit and the script Telugu.

The record gives the genealogy of the Kakatiya kings which is traced to Ikshvaku and states that to the same line belongs Kalikala Chola. The donor Ganapati is said to have received homage from the kings of Kasi, Kalinga, Saka, Malava, Kerala, Tummana Hunas, Kurus, Pagan, Magadha, Nepal and Cholas. This looks like an exaggerated account of his conquests. The grant is said to belong to I245 A. D.

No. 5. Munirabad stone inscription of Vikramaditya VI

Edited by RAO SAHEB H. KRISHNA SASTRI

The record is in old Kanarese language and script

It states that in the thirteenth year of king Vikrama VI and on the occasion of Sankranti-Vyatipata, the brahmin Somanatha and his wife constructed the Siva temple of Someswara at Puligepulge or Vyaghra-grama (modern Munirabad) and conferred on it some lands. The temple was situated on the river Tungabhadra near Gautamasrama on the Citra-sala of Sri-kuta hill. The date of the record is 1088 A. D.

No. 6. The Kotagiri plates of Queen Rudramba

Edited by S. HÀNUMANTHA RAO
Revised by H. Krishna Sastri

The language is sanskrit and the script is Devanagari

The plates refer to the reign of Rudramamba who is mentioned as the daughter of king Ganapati and not his wife. A new

line of feudal princes belonging to the Viriyala family is also mentioned and one of them Sura gave the village of Vijjalapuri as a gift to several brahmins. The date of the record is 1273 A. D.

No. 7. Bodhan inscription of the reign of Someswara I

Edited by RAO BAHADUR R. NARASIMHACHARYA M. A.

The inscription is in old Kanarese language and script.

The record refers to the reign of Someswara I and states that the Indra Narayana temple built at Bhodhan by the Rashtrakuta Emperor Indra fell into ruins and so Jogapayya, a servant of Ahavamalla renovated it in 1056 A. D. and endowed it with villages.

We have great pleasure in congratulating G. Yazdani Esq, M. A., Superintendent of Archaeology Nizam's Govt., on the excellent way in which he has arranged to publish a series of valuable inscriptions, both copper-plate and stone, which throw a flood of new light on the history of some of the dynasties that once ruled over Andhra Desa.

R. S. R.

/

IMPORTANT ARTICLES IN ORIENTAL JOURNALS

1. *The journal of Oriental Research, Madras.* (Vol. I. Part I.)
   Problems of identity in the cultural history of Ancient India. By Prof. S. Kuppuswami sastri.
   The Vyaghras and their identification A. V. Venkarama Iyer.
2. *The Vedic Magazine Lahore* (Vol XXV No. II)
   Evolution and the Vedas. S. P. Vedalankar.
3. *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore* (Vol XVII Nos. I, II)
   Historical carvings at Vijayanagara Rev. H. Heras S. J., M. A.
   The cult of Agastya and the origin of the Indian Colonial art. O. C. Gangoly.
4. *The Mahabodhi Journal, Calcutta*
   Is the Doctrine of the Buddha, Science? Dr. Georg Grimm.
5. *Indian Antiguary, Bombay.* (Vol LVI.)
   Yasodhavala Paramara and his inscription. R. R. Halder.
6. *The Eastern Buddhist.* (Vol IV. No. I.)
   A discussion of the origin of Mahayana Buddhism R. C. Armstrong.
7. *Journal of the Cama Oriental Institute Bombay.* (No. 8.)
   Some new facts and theories relating to Parsi history.
8. *Journal of Indian History, Madras.* (Vol. IV. Parts I, II, III.)
   The Diplomatic theories of ancient India and Arthasastra Dr. K. Nag and Mr. V. R. V. Dikshitar.
   The great civil war of Vizianagaram Rev. H. Heras, S. J., M. A.
   Forgotten episodes in the history of Mediaeval India Dr. S. K. Iyengar.
9. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona.* (Vol. VII, VIII.)
   Date of Kautilya, D. R. Bhandarkar.
   The Geography of Vatsyayana H. C. Chakladar.
   Hindu theories of punishment J. N. C. Ganguly.
   Magadha and Rajgriha in Pali literature, Dr. Bimala Charan Law.
   Parasika dominion in ancient India, D. R. Bhandarkar.
10. *Journal of the B. B. Royal Asiatic Society.* (Vol. II no 1.)
    The serpent sacrifice mentioned in Mahabharatha. M. Winternitz.
11. *Journal of Indologie and Iranistik Leipzig.* (Vol. IV parts I & II)
    An enquiry into the age of the Upanishads. Eric Fraauwallner.
    Early history of sanskrit philology. Th. Zachariae.

LIST OF MEMBERS WHO PAID THEIR SUBSCRIPTIONS DURING THE QUARTER

Messrs.	Rs.
1. Dharani Ramachandra-Rao	3- 0-0
2. S. Perisastry.	3- 0-0
3. Kalabarigi Narasimha Rao	4- 0-0
4. Bhagavantam gupta	3- 0-0
5. Dewan Bahadur C. Vencatachelam Pantulu,	4- 0-0
6. Jayanti Ganganna	2- 0-0
7, S. Hanumanta Rao,	3- 0-0
8. N. Rangachary	3- 0-0
9. Somasundara desikar	3- 0-0
10. S. Roy	3- 0-0
11. Ivaturi Virabasavaraju	3- 2-0
12. K. Sitaramayya	4- 2-0
13. G. Jagannadha swamy	4- 2-0
14. K. Kesava Ramamurty	3- 2-0
15. P. Linganna	3- 2-0
16. G. V. Raghava Rao,	3- 2-0
17. K. Rangachary	4- 2-0
18. Rao Saheb G. V. Ramamurti Pantulu	3- 0-0
19. G. V. Sitapati	3- 0-0
20. P. H. Ananta Rama-Iyer	3- 0-0
21. Rev. H. Heras	3- 0-0
22. Vavilla Venkateswarlu	3- 0-0
23. S. Narasimha Iyengar	4- 0-0
24. C. Krishna Rao	4- 2-0
25. P. Raghavendra Rao	3- 2-0
26. T. Sivasankara sastry	3- 2-0
27. S. Subrahmanya sastry	3- 2-0
28. Adivi Bapiraju	3- 2-0
29. Duruseti Appa Rao	3- 0-0
30. Pappu Somasundaram	3- 0-0
31. P. Satyanarayana Rao	3- 0-0
32. A. Venkatachelam	3- 0-0
33. M. Krishnamachary	4- 2-0
34 A. V. Sankhyana-Sarma	3- 2-0
35. N. Jagannadha Rao	3- 2-0
36. K. Iswara Dutt	3- 2-0
37. P. S. Rao,	3- 2-0
38. Nalam Krishna Rao,	4- 0-0
39. Nagulapati Venkata Subbarao,	3- 0-0
40. Manda Narasimulu	3- 2-0
41. Bhamidipati Satyanarayana	4- 0-0
42. K. RamakoteswaraRao	3- 2-0
43. Ivaturi Kanakachelum	4- 0-0
44. Iyyenki Venkata Ramanayya	3- 0-0
45. K. Rajaratnam	4- 0-0
46. S. Subramanyam	3- 0-0
47. N. K. Venkatesam	2- 0-0
48. S. Nagabhusanam	1- 0-0
49. G. Gangaraju	3- 0-0
50. S. S. Setlur	3- 2-0
51. N. Rangaswamy	3- 2-0
52. Y.V. Ranganayakamma	4- 0-0
53. G. Lakshmanareddi	3-0 -0
54. C. Chandrasekhara-Reddi	3- 0-0
55. B. Sivaramayya	3- 0-0
56. Mallampalli Somasekhara Sarma	4- 0-0
57. Jayanti Satyanarayana	2- 0-0
58. T. Ramakrishnarao	3- 2-0
59. T. Bhujanga Rao,	3- 0-0
60. G. G. Somayajulu	3- 0-0
61. R. Venkatasivudu	3- 0-0
62. N. Rangareddi	3- 2-0
63. K. Sitaramarao	4- 0-0
64. Challa Surya Prakasa Rao,	3- 0-0
65. M. Satyanarayana	2- 0-0
66. P. Kurmarao	3- 0-0
	209-14-0

DONATIONS.

1. N. Kameswara Rao, (Treasurer)	25- 0-0
2. Voruganti Subbarao	25- 0-0
	50- 0-0

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS TO JOURNAL WHO PAID THEIR SUBSCRIPTIONS DURING THE QUARTER.

1. Secretariat Library, Fort St. George	6- 0-0
2. Principal, Maryo College, Ajmer	6- 0-0
3. Director of Information, Secretariat, Bombay	6- 0-0
4. Director General of Archaeology, Simla	6- 0-0
5. Principal, P. R. College, Cocanada	6- 2-0
6. Registrar, Andhra University	6- 0-0
7. Principal, Noble College Masulipatam	6- 0-0
8. President, Carnatic Historical Society, Dharwar	6- 0-0
9. Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Eastern circle	6- 0-0
10. Curator, Provincial Museum, Lucknow	6- 0-0
11. Principal, Presy College, Calcutta	6- 0-0
12. Comissioner, Ajmer Merwara	6- 0-0
13. Music guimet, Paris	3- 0-0
14. Principal, Sanskrit College, Benares	6- 0-0
15. Secretary, Teacher's Association, Bhadrachelam	6- 0-0
	87- 2-0

NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

Public Meetings.

A public meeting under the auspices of the Society was held on 4-12-1926, in the Hindn Samaj Hall, when Mr. Varanasi Suryanarayana Sastri, delivered an instructive lecture on "*Andhra-bhâshanusasanam.*" Pundit Prayaga Venkatarama Sastri garu presided.

Another public meeting of the Society was held on 5-12-1926, in the Hindu Samaj Hall, when Mr. S. Bhimasankara Rao, B. A. read an interesting paper on 'The Maha-Bharatha War, and its historic importance.'

Mr, D. S. Reddi, B. A. (Oxon.) Vice-President of the Society presided.

"Andhrabhasha-nusasanam" is a recent work on Telugu Grammar written with great erudition by Pundit M. Suryanarayana Sastri garu, Telugu Pundit, Government Arts College, Rajahmundry

Meetings of the Council.

Proceedings cf the Council meeting held on 12-11-26.

Resolution passed by circulation among the members of the Council.

"Resolved that M. R. Ry. Ivaturi Kanakachalam Pantulu garu, M. A., L. T., Headmaster, Rajah's College, Parlakimidi, be requested to be so good as to make all necessary arrangements for the celebration of the Kalinga Day at Mukhalingam, on 26th and 27th Dec. 1926, as was resolved by this council at its meeting held on 27-10-26. and that he be requested to co-opt members for the Reception Committee.

Signed. Bhavaraju V. Krishna Rao.
Chilukuri Veerabhadra Rao.
R, Subba Rao.
N. Kameswara Rao.
V. Appa Rao.

Proceedings of the Council meeting held on 20-11-26.

Resolutions passed by circulation among the members of the Côuncil.

"Resolved that Messrs. R. Subba Rao and B. V. Krishna Rao· Joint Secretaries of the Society be requested to proceed to Madras and wait on a deputation on the Rajah Saheb of Parlakimidi now in Madras, to request him to help the Society in the matter of the Kalinga Day Celebration at Mukhalingam."

2. "Resolved that Rs. 30- (Thirty rupees only) be sanctioned as travelling expenses to the Secretaries.

3. Resolved that the Secretaries may co-opt other members of the Society and any prominent gentlemen at Madras to join in the deputation."

Signed. C. Narayana Rao.
N. Kameswara Rao.
Bhavaraju V. Krishna Rao.
R. Subba Rao.
D. S. Reddi.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

Proceedings of the Council meeting held on 2-12-1926.

Present. Mr. D. S. Reddi, Vice-President, (in the chair),
,, Ch. Veerabhadra Rao,
,, C. Narayana Rao,
,, N. Kameswara Rao.
,, R. Subba Rao.
,, B. V. Krishna Rao.

I. Resolved that the following gentlemen, having signified their assent to become members, be enrolled as members of the Society.

Messrs.
1. P. Satyanarayana Rao, M. A. (Oxon.), I. C. S.
2. C. Suryaprakasa Rao, B. A.
3. R. Venkatasivudu, M. A.
4. Prof. Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar, M. A.
5. N. Rangaswami, M. A.
6. K. L. Narasimha Rao.
7. G. Gangaraju
8. V. Venkateswara Sastrulu.
6. Prof. Henry Heras S. J., M. A.
10. William Bertie Brierly, I. E. S.
11. Ch. Raghava Rao, M. A., B. L.
12. P. Satyanarayana, M. A., M. L.
13. Pandit Hirananda Sastri, M. A.
14. D. Appa Rao, Bar-at-Law.
15. D. Sobhanadri Sastri, M. A., B. Com.
16. P. Somasundaram, B. A., B. L.
17. Prattipati Satyanarayana Rao B. A., B. L.
18. A. Venkatachalam, B. A., B. L.
19. C. Rama Rao, B. A., B. L.
20. K. Rajaratnam, B. A.

Messrs. 21. N. Venkata Subba Rao
22. T. Ramakrishna Rao, B. A., L. T.
23. B. Satyanarayana, B. A., L. T.

II. Resolved that the following Journals be accepted in Exchange for our Journal.

1. Jaina Gazette
2. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
3. Archaelogical Series published by the Archl. Department H. E. H. The Nizam's Government.
4. Zietschrift fur Indologie (Journal of Indian Phiolological Research) Halle, (Saale.)
5. Mysore Economic Journal.
6. Journale de la Societie de L' Histoire de L'Inde Francaise, Pondicherry.
7. Educational Review, Madras.
8. Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society,
9. Journal of Indian History, Madras.
10. Nagari Pracharini Patrika, Benares.

III. Read letter from Mr. C. Hayavadana Rao, Editor, Mysore Economic Journal, Bangalore.
Resolved to supply him with a copy of "Sri Rajaraja Pattabhisheka-Sanchika" for review in the Mysore Economic Journal.

IV. Resolved that the following gentlemen be considered to have resigned their membership of the Society.

Messrs. 1. Adidam Narayanamurthi.
2. Ganala Ramamurty.
3. Bhagavatula Appa Rao.
4. Iyyanki Venkata Ramanayya.
5. Dr. B. Seshagiri Rao.
6. N. Sundaram Pantulu.
7. J. V. Krishna Rao.

V. Resolved that the Sum of Rs. 150 (One hundred and fifty only) advanced by the Treasurer on 7-10-1926, and 19-10-1926 be returned to him with thanks.
(Vide Proceedings of the Council dated 27-10-1926.)

VI. Resolved that the sum of Rs. 100 (one Hundred only) advanced by the Treasurer on 8-11-1926, for paying the Printer be approved.

VII. Resolved that two members of the Society be deputed to enlist support for the Society, and that any expenses they might incur be met by the Society.

VIII. Resolved that the following members do form a Sub-Committee and fix up a programme, and make all necessary arrangements for the Kalinga Day Celebrations, on 26th and 27th December, with power to add to their number.

Messrs. C. Narayana Rao.
R. Subba Rao.
B. V. Krishna Rao.
I. Kanakachalam Pantulu.

IX. Resolved that the Raja of Parlakimidi, Sri Sri Sri Krishna Chandra Gajapati Narayana Deo Bahadur Varu, be elected as a PATRON of the Society.

X. Resolved that M. R. Ry. Dr. S. Krishna Swami Aiyangar Avl., M. A., Ph. D., University Professor of History & Archaeology Madras, be elected as an Honorary Vice-President of the Society.

XI. Resolved that the accounts of the Society from 27-10-1926 to 2-12-1926, be passed,

Proceedings of the Council meeting held on 10-12-1926.

Present:—Mr. C. Narayana Rao (in the chair.)
Mr. M. Ramakrishna Kavi.
Mr. R. Subba Rao.
B. V. Krishna Rao.
N. Kameswara Rao.

I. Resolved that the Rani of Kolanka and Veeravaram Estates Sri Sri Sri Rani Rao Ramayamma Rao Bahadur Varu be electad as the Vice-Patron of the Society.

II. Resolved that the following gentlemen be admitted as members of the Society.

Messrs. 1 M. Narasimham.
2 S. Kameswara Rao, B.A., B. L.
3 S. Subrahmanyam.
4 Iyyanki Venkata Ramanayya
5 Vadrevu Bapiraju, B.A., B. L.
6 Sri Raja Vikrama Deva Varma Garu.

III. Resolved that the following Journals be accepted as exchanges for our Journal.

1. Journal of the Academy of Fine Arts, Paris.
2. Journal of the Maha Bodhi Society, Calcutta.
3. Annual Reports of the Epigraphical Department Southern Circle, Madras.
4. Archæological Publications of the Govt. Museum, Madras,